arXiv:1702.00473v2 [math.PR] 30 Mar 2017

Fundamental limits of low-rank matrix estimation: the non-symmetric case

Léo Miolane*

Abstract

We consider the high-dimensional inference problem where the signal is a low-rank matrix which is corrupted by an additive Gaussian noise. Given a probabilistic model for the low-rank matrix, we compute the limit in the large dimension setting for the mutual information between the signal and the observations, as well as the matrix minimum mean square error, while the rank of the signal remains constant. This allows to locate the information-theoretic threshold for this estimation problem, i.e. the critical value of the signal intensity below which it is impossible to recover the low-rank matrix. This proves a conjecture of [25].

1 Introduction

Estimating a low-rank matrix from a noisy observation is a fundamental problem in statistical inference with applications in machine learning, signal processing or information theory. It encompass numerous classical statistical problems from PCA, sparse PCA to high-dimensional Gaussian mixture clustering (see [24]). Consider a signal matrix $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\intercal$ where $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are two $n \times k$ and $m \times k$ independent matrices. We will be interested in the low-rank, high-dimensional setting, i.e. k will remain fixed as $n, m \to \infty$ and $m/n \to \alpha > 1$. Given a noisy observation $\mathbf{Y}$ of the matrix $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\intercal$ we would like to reconstruct the signal. We consider here additive white Gaussian noise $\mathbf{Z}$ (where $Z_{i,j} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$):

$$\mathbf{Y} = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}\,\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\intercal + \mathbf{Z} \tag{1}$$

where λ captures the strength of the signal. Thanks to the universality property first introduced in [25] and proved in [22], our results with additive Gaussian noise have direct implications for a wide range of channels. In this paper, we aim at computing the best achievable performance (in term of mean square error) for the estimation of the low-rank signal. We prove limiting expressions for the mutual information $I((\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V});\mathbf{Y})$ and the minimum mean square error (MMSE), as conjectured in [25]. This allows us to compute the information-theoretic threshold for this estimation problem. More precisely, we derive a critical value λ_c such that when $\lambda < \lambda_c$ no algorithm can retrieve the signal better than a "random guess" whereas for $\lambda > \lambda_c$ the signal can be estimated more accurately. As mentioned above, high-dimensional Gaussian mixture clustering can be seen as a particular instance of the matrix factorization problem (1) (see [24, 3]). The present work justify therefore the non-rigorous derivation of the information-theoretic threshold for Gaussian mixture clustering from [24].

Random matrix models like (1) has received much attention in random matrix theory. In 1976 Edwards and Jones [13] observed using the non-rigorous "replica" method: "there is a critical finite value [for λ] above which a single eigenvalue [of $\mathbf{Y}/\sqrt{n}$] splits off from the semi-circular continuum of eigenvalues". This phase transition phenomenon for the largest eigenvalue of perturbed random matrices has then been rigorously understood in the seminal work of Baik, Ben Arous and Péché [2] and following papers [14, 8]. Suppose for instance that $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are vectors with i.i.d. coefficients with zero mean and unit variance. Results from [8] give then

- if $\lambda \leq 1$, the top singular value of $\mathbf{Y}/\sqrt{n}$ converges a.s. to 2 as $n \to \infty$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ be the respectively the left and right unit singular vectors of $\mathbf{Y}/\sqrt{n}$ associated with this top singular value. Then $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ have trivial correlation with the planted solution: $\frac{1}{n}\hat{\mathbf{u}}^\intercal\mathbf{U} \to 0$ and $\frac{1}{n}\hat{\mathbf{v}}^\intercal\mathbf{V} \to 0$.

*INRIA-ENS, Paris France, email: leo.miolane@inria.fr

– if $\lambda > 1$, the top eigenvalue of $\mathbf{Y}/\sqrt{n}$ converges a.s. to $\sqrt{\lambda} + 1/\sqrt{\lambda} > 2$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ be the respectively the left and right unit singular vectors of $\mathbf{Y}/\sqrt{n}$ associated with this top singular value. Then $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ achieve a non-trivial correlation with the solution: $(\frac{1}{n}\hat{\mathbf{u}}^\intercal \mathbf{U})^2 \to 1 - 1/\lambda$ and $(\frac{1}{n}\hat{\mathbf{v}}^\intercal \mathbf{V})^2 \to 1 - 1/\lambda$.

This means that when λ goes below 1, the singular vector associated with the top singular value becomes suddenly uninformative. The question then arises: is it still possible to build a non trivial estimator of the signal when $\lambda \leq 1$? How does the optimal performance depends on λ and the priors P_U and P_V on the entries of $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$?

To answer this question, one has to analyze the performance of the optimal estimator (in term of mean square error). This estimator is known to be the posterior mean of the signal given the observations. However computing such an estimator leads to untractable expressions and exponential-time algorithms. This motivated the study of efficient message passing algorithms for solving the matrix factorization problem (1). Rangan and Fletcher [36] proposed an Approximate Message Passing (AMP) algorithm (based on the previous work of [12]) to estimate the low-rank signal. Deshpande and Montanari [11] considered then the case of Bernoulli Ber(ϵ) priors and showed that AMP was optimal for ϵ above a certain critical value $\epsilon_* > 0$. Interestingly, Lesieur et al. [26] conjectured using non-rigorous methods from statistical physics that the estimation problem may become hard for $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_*$: it would still be possible to recover the signal partially, but not with AMP or any polynomial-time algorithm. Consequently, a careful analysis of AMP algorithm as in [11] would fail to derive information-theoretic threshold in the presence of such hard phase. Lesieur et al. also conjectured in [25] limiting expression for the mutual information and the MMSE. This conjecture was recently proved for the rank-one ($k = 1$) and symmetric ($\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V}$) case by Barbier et al. [4] using spatial coupling techniques, under some technical assumptions. Few months later, [23] gave another proof for the low-rank symmetric case.

A completely different proof technique based on second moment computations and contiguity has been used to derive upper and lower bounds for the information-theoretic threshold. See the recent works [3, 35, 34] and the references therein. These bounds are however not expected to be tight in the regime considered in this paper.

In this paper we extend and deepen the ideas of [23] to prove the limiting expressions for the mutual information and the MMSE conjectured in [25]. It builds on the mathematical approach of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model: see the books of Talagrand [37] and Panchenko [33]. Our estimation problem is indeed equivalent to a bipartite spin glass model that is closely related to SK model studied in the groundbreaking book of Mezard, Parisi and Virasoro [29]. The methods developed in [29] have then been widely applied to other spin glass models, and in particular models arising from Bayesian estimation problems. This class of models enjoys specific properties due to the presence of the planted (hidden) solution of the estimation problem and to the fact that the parameters of the inference channel (noise, priors...) are supposed to be known by the statistician. In the statistical physics jargon, the system is on the "Nishimori line" (see [32, 18, 20]), a region of the phase diagram where no "replica symmetry breaking" occurs. These properties will play a crucial role in our proofs. They imply that important quantities will concentrate around their means: the system will then be characterized using only few parameters. For a detailed introduction to the connections between statistical physics and statistical inference, see [39]. Bipartite spin glasses are also of special interest because they are related to Hopfield model [17]. The bipartite SK model has been investigated in [6, 7], but the study relies on an additional hypothesis, namely the "replica-symmetric" assumption which will be verified for our "planted" model.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce our model in the case of rank-one matrix estimation ($\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are random vectors) and state our main results. For the sake of clarity, we first concentrate on this simpler setting and provides a detailed proof in Section 5. The generalization to the finite-rank case will then be presented in Section 6. Section 4 proves a general concentration result for posterior distributions in Bayesian inference that we use to prove our main results. We illustrate our results with numerical experiments in Section 2.5. Finally, we connect in Section 2.6 our results to the study of Approximate Message Passing (AMP) algorithms.

Acknowledgments. The author is grateful to M. Lelarge for numerous comments and feedback and to L. Zdeborová and F. Krzakala for pointing out interesting papers.

2 The Replica-Symmetric formula

For simplicity, we first present the rank-one case with discrete priors (and $\alpha = 1$). The extension to finite-rank and any square-integrable priors is done in Section 6.

2.1 Problem statement

Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite set. We can thus find $K_0 > 0$ such that $S \subset [-K_0, K_0]$. Let P_U and P_V be two probability distributions with finite support S. Moreover we assume that $\mathrm{Var}_{P_U}(U), \mathrm{Var}_{P_V}(V) > 0$. We define $P_0 = P_U \otimes P_V$.

Let $\lambda > 0$ and consider now i.i.d. random variables $(U_i, V_i)_{1 \le i \le n} \sim P_0$. We observe

$$Y_{i,j} = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}} U_i V_j + Z_{i,j}, \quad \text{for } 1 \le i, j \le n \tag{2}$$

where $Z_{i,j}$ are i.i.d. standard normal random variables. In the following, $\mathbb{E}$ will denote the expectation with respect to the variables $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ and $\mathbf{Z}$. Let us define the minimal mean square error for the estimation of the matrix $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\intercal$ given the observation of the matrix $\mathbf{Y}$:

$$\mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) = \min_{\hat{\theta}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \le i,j \le n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_i V_j - \hat{\theta}_{i,j}(\mathbf{Y}) \right)^2 \right] \right\} = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \le i,j \le n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_i V_j - \mathbb{E}\left[U_i V_j | \mathbf{Y} \right] \right)^2 \right],$$

where the minimum is taken over all estimators $\hat{\theta}$ (i.e. measurable functions of the observations $\mathbf{Y}$ that could also depend on auxiliary randomness).

In order to get an upper bound on the matrix minimum mean square error, we will consider the "dummy estimators", i.e. estimators $\hat{\theta}$ that do not depend on $\mathbf{Y}$ (and that are thus independent of $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$). If $\hat{\theta}$ is a dummy estimator, its mean square error is equal to

$$\mathrm{MSE}(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \le i,j \le n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_i V_j - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{i,j}] \right)^2 \right] + \mathrm{Var}(\hat{\theta}_{i,j})$$

because $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ and $\hat{\theta}$ are independent. Therefore, the "best" dummy estimator (in term of mean square error) is $\hat{\theta}_{i,j} = \mathbb{E}[U_i V_j]$ for all $1 \le i, j \le n$. This gives an asymptotic "dummy" matrix mean square error of:

$$\mathrm{DMSE} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \le i,j \le n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_i V_j - \mathbb{E}[U_i V_j] \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}[U^2]\mathbb{E}[V^2] - (\mathbb{E}U)^2 (\mathbb{E}V)^2$$

As we will see later in Corollary 8, the limits of the MMSE for the low- and high-signal regimes are

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0} \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) = \mathrm{DMSE}$$
$$\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) = 0$$

It is important to note that the regime considered in this paper corresponds to a high noise regime: the MMSE will be positive for any finite value of λ in our model (2). In particular, exact reconstruction of the signal is typically not possible.

Our goal is to locate the information-theoretic threshold for the estimation problem (2), i.e. the value of λ below which it not possible to estimate the matrix better than a dummy estimator, when $n \to \infty$. We need therefore to compute the limit of $\mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda)$ as $n \to \infty$, for any value of λ. We will see in the sequel that this reduces to the computation of the limit of the mutual information $\frac{1}{n} I\big((U, V); Y\big)$.

2.2 Connection with statistical physics

We will now connect our statistical estimation problem (2) with statistical physics concepts, namely the notions of Hamiltonian, free energy, replicas and overlap.

For $(u_0, v_0) \in S^2$ and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in S^n \times S^n$ we will use the notations

$$\begin{cases} P_0(u_0, v_0) & = \mathbb{P}(U = u_0,\ V = v_0) \\ P_0(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) & = \prod_{i=1}^n P_0(u_i, v_i) \end{cases}$$

It will be convenient to express the posterior distribution of $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ given $\mathbf{Y}$ in a "Boltzmann" form. We define the Hamiltonian

$$H_n(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{1 \le i,j \le n} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}} u_i v_j Z_{i,j} + \frac{\lambda}{n} u_i U_i v_j V_j - \frac{\lambda}{2n} u_i^2 v_j^2, \quad \text{for } (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in S^n \times S^n. \tag{3}$$

The posterior distribution of $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ given $\mathbf{Y}$ is then

$$\mathbb{P}\big((\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) | \mathbf{Y}\big) = \frac{1}{Z_n} P_0(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \exp\left(\sum_{1 \le i,j \le n} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}} Y_{i,j} u_i v_j - \frac{\lambda}{2n} u_i^2 v_j^2 \right) = \frac{1}{Z_n} P_0(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) e^{H_n(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})} \tag{4}$$

where $Z_n = \sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) e^{H_n(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})}$ is the appropriate normalizing constant. The free energy of this model is defined as

$$F_n = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \log Z_n = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \log \left(\sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) e^{H_n(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})} \right).$$

In statistical physics, the free energy is a fundamental quantity that encodes a lot of information about the system. For instance, its derivative with respect to the inverse temperature corresponds to the average energy. In our context of statistical inference, we will see that the free energy contains a lot of relevant information for our estimation problem. In particular, we will see that it corresponds (up to an affine transformation) to the mutual information $\frac{1}{n} I\big((\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}); \mathbf{Y}\big)$ of the observation channel. Moreover, its derivative with respect to the signal-to-noise ratio λ (which plays the role of the inverse temperature) is linked to the minimum mean-square error of our problem: this corresponds to a kind of "I-MMSE Theorem", see [16]. The asymptotic behavior of the mutual information and the MMSE will therefore be linked to the limit of the free energy.

We introduce now central notions of the study of spin glasses: *Gibbs measure*, *replica* and *overlap*. In our context we define the *Gibbs measure* $\langle \cdot \rangle$ as the posterior distribution (4). $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is thus a random probability measure (depending on $\mathbf{Y}$) on $S^n \times S^n$. We will also have consider i.i.d. samples $(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}^{(1)}), \dots, (\mathbf{u}^{(m)}, \mathbf{v}^{(m)})$ (conditionally to $\mathbf{Y}$) from $\langle \cdot \rangle$. Such samples will be called *replicas*. For $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define the *overlap* between $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(2)}$ as the rescaled scalar product

$$\mathbf{x}^{(1)} . \mathbf{x}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{(1)} x_i^{(2)}. \tag{5}$$

We define also the rescaled norm $\|\mathbf{x}^{(1)}\|$ as $\sqrt{\mathbf{x}^{(1)} . \mathbf{x}^{(1)}}$.

Before moving to the asymptotic analysis of the inference problem (2), we need to state a fundamental identity that will be used repeatedly and is true in a general setting. This was discovered by Nishimori (see for instance [32]) and extensively used in the context of Bayesian inference, see [18, 21, 39]. It express the fact that the planted configuration $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ behaves like a sample $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ from the posterior distribution $\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = . | \mathbf{Y})$.

Proposition 1 (*Nishimori identity*)

Let $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ be a couple of random variables on a polish space. Let $k \ge 1$ and let $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ be k i.i.d. samples (given $\mathbf{Y}$) from the distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} = . | \mathbf{Y})$, independently of every other random variables. Let us denote $\langle \cdot \rangle$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} = . | \mathbf{Y})$ and $\mathbb{E}$ the expectation with respect to $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$. Then, for all continuous bounded function f

$$\mathbb{E} \langle f(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle f(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}, \mathbf{X}) \rangle$$

Proof. It is equivalent to sample the couple $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ according to its joint distribution or to sample first $\mathbf{Y}$ according to its marginal distribution and then to sample $\mathbf{X}$ conditionally to $\mathbf{Y}$ from its conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} = .|\mathbf{Y})$. Thus the $(k+1)$-tuple $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ has the same law than $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}, \mathbf{X})$. □

We will now illustrate the concepts of Gibbs distribution, replicas and the Nishimori identity by computing the derivative of the free energy F_n with respect to the signal λ. The arguments used in this computation will be used repeatedly in the proofs of this paper. $\lambda \mapsto F_n$ is differentiable over $(0, +\infty)$ and for $\lambda > 0$

$$F_n'(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\Big\langle \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda n}} u_i v_j Z_{i,j} + \frac{1}{n} u_i U_i v_j V_j - \frac{1}{2n} u_i^2 v_j^2 \Big\rangle,$$

where $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is a replica sampled from the Gibbs distribution $\langle\cdot\rangle$. Let $1 \le i, j \le n$. Using the Gaussian integration by parts, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Z_{i,j}\langle u_i v_j\rangle\right] = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}\mathbb{E}\left[\langle u_i^2 v_j^2\rangle\right] - \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}\mathbb{E}\left[\langle u_i v_j\rangle^2\right].$$

Let $(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}^{(1)})$ and $(\mathbf{u}^{(2)}, \mathbf{v}^{(2)})$ be two independent replicas from the Gibbs distribution $\langle\cdot\rangle$. We have then $\mathbb{E}\langle u_i v_j\rangle^2 = \mathbb{E}\langle u_i^{(1)} v_j^{(1)} u_i^{(2)} v_j^{(2)}\rangle$. We use now the Nishimori identity (Proposition 1) to obtain $\mathbb{E}\langle u_i^{(1)} v_j^{(1)} u_i^{(2)} v_j^{(2)}\rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle u_i v_j U_i V_j\rangle$. Consequently $\mathbb{E}\left[Z_{i,j}\langle u_i v_j\rangle\right] = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}\mathbb{E}\langle u_i^2 v_j^2\rangle - \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}\mathbb{E}\langle u_i v_j U_i V_j\rangle$ and finally

$$F_n'(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2n^2}\mathbb{E}\Big\langle \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} u_i U_i v_j V_j \Big\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{u}.\mathbf{U})(\mathbf{v}.\mathbf{V}) \Big\rangle \tag{6}$$

2.3 Effective scalar channel

As we will see in Theorem 4, the limit of F_n is linked to a simple 1-dimensional inference problem. Let P_X be a probability distribution with finite second moment. Let $\gamma \ge 0$ and consider the following observation channel:

$$Y = \sqrt{\gamma} X + Z \tag{7}$$

where $X \sim P_X$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ are independent random variables. Note that the posterior distribution of X knowing Y is then given by

$$dP(X = x|Y) = \frac{1}{Z(Y)} dP_X(x) e^{Y\sqrt{\gamma}x - \frac{\gamma x^2}{2}} \tag{8}$$

where the random variable $Z(Y)$ is the normalizing constant:

$$Z(Y) = \int dP_X(x) e^{Y\sqrt{\gamma}x - \frac{\gamma x^2}{2}} = \int dP_X(x) e^{\gamma x X + \sqrt{\gamma} x Z - \frac{\gamma x^2}{2}}.$$

We will denote by $\langle\cdot\rangle_\gamma$ the expectation with respect to the posterior distribution (8). We define

$$F_{P_X} : \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{E}\langle xX\rangle_\gamma \tag{9}$$

where x is sampled from $\langle\cdot\rangle_\gamma$ independently of everything else. F_{P_X} computes the overlap in the channel (7). We define also the free energy of the channel as $\mathbb{E}[\log Z(Y)]$, which can be seen as a function of γ:

$$\psi_{P_X} : \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{E}\log\left(\int dP_X(x) \exp(\sqrt{\gamma} x Z + \gamma x X - \frac{\gamma}{2} x^2)\right) \tag{10}$$

The main properties of the functions ψ_{P_X} and F_{P_X} are presented in Section 7.1. In the sequel we will consider the scalar channel (7) for $P_X = P_U$ or $P_X = P_V$. We will be interested in values of the signal intensity (γ_1, γ_2) that satisfy fixed point equations.

Definition 2

We define the set $\Gamma(\lambda)$ *as*

$$\Gamma(\lambda) = \left\{(q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \;\middle|\; q_2 = F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1) \text{ and } q_1 = F_{P_V}(\lambda q_2)\right\} \tag{11}$$

First notice that $\Gamma(\lambda)$ is not empty. When $\mathbb{E}U = \mathbb{E}V = 0$ this is obvious: we have $(0,0) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$, so $\Gamma(\lambda) \neq \emptyset$. In the general case, we notice that the function $F : (q_1, q_2) \mapsto (F_{P_V}(\lambda q_2), F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1))$ is continuous from the convex compact set $[0, \mathbb{E}V^2] \times [0, \mathbb{E}U^2]$ into itself (see Lemma 39). Brouwer's theorem gives the existence of a fixed point of F: $\Gamma(\lambda) \neq \emptyset$.

The next lemma shows that for λ large enough (high-signal regime), a non-trivial fixed point appears.

Lemma 3

There exists $\eta > 0$ and $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, there exists $(q_1, q_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$ such that $q_1, q_2 \geq \eta$.

Proof. By assumptions: $\mathbb{E}[U^2], \mathbb{E}[V^2] > 0$. The point (vii) from Lemma 39 implies that there exists $\eta > 0$ and $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that

$$F_{P_U}(\gamma_0) \geq \eta, \text{ and, } F_{P_V}(\gamma_0) \geq \eta. \tag{12}$$

Define $\lambda_0 = \frac{\gamma_0}{\eta}$. Let $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ and $(q_1, q_2) \in [\eta, \mathbb{E}V^2] \times [\eta, \mathbb{E}U^2]$. We have then $\lambda q_1, \lambda q_2 \geq \gamma_0$. Equation (12) and the monotonicity of F_{P_U} and F_{P_V} (point (iv) from Lemma 39) imply

$$\mathbb{E}U^2 > F_{P_U}(\lambda q_2) \geq \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}V^2 > F_{P_V}(\lambda q_1) \geq \eta.$$

This means that the function $F : (q_1, q_2) \mapsto (F_{P_V}(\lambda q_2), F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1))$ is a continuous function from the convex compact set $[\eta, \mathbb{E}V^2] \times [\eta, \mathbb{E}U^2]$ to itself. Brouwer's theorem guarantees the existence of a fixed point of F on $[\eta, \mathbb{E}V^2] \times [\eta, \mathbb{E}U^2]$. This proves the lemma. □

2.4 The Replica-Symmetric formula and its consequences

We will express the limit of F_n using the following function

$$\mathcal{F} : (\lambda, q_1, q_2) \mapsto \psi_{P_U}(\lambda q_1) + \psi_{P_V}(\lambda q_2) - \frac{\lambda}{2} q_1 q_2$$

$\mathcal{F}$ corresponds to the free energy of the two scalar channels (7) associated to P_U and P_V, minus the term $\frac{\lambda}{2} q_1 q_2$. The Replica-Symmetric formula states that the free energy F_n converges to the supremum of $\mathcal{F}$ over $\Gamma(\lambda)$.

Theorem 4 (*Replica-Symmetric formula*)

$$F_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \sup_{(q_1,q_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2) = \sup_{q_1 \geq 0} \inf_{q_2 \geq 0} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2) \tag{13}$$

Moreover, these extrema are achieved over the same couples $(q_1, q_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$.

Theorem 4 is (with Theorem 27 that generalizes to any multidimensional input distribution and any α) the main result of this paper and is proved in Section 5. This proves a conjecture from [25], in particular $\mathcal{F}$ corresponds to the "Bethe free energy" ([25], Equation 47). The Replica-Symmetric formula allows to compute the limit of the mutual information for the inference channel (2).

Corollary 5 (*Limit of the mutual information*)

$$\frac{1}{n} I((\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}); \mathbf{Y}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E}[U^2]\mathbb{E}[V^2] - \sup_{(q_1,q_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2)$$

Proof. We decompose $I((\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}); \mathbf{Y}) = H(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) - H(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}|\mathbf{Y})$. By equation (4) we have

$$H(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}|\mathbf{Y}) = -\mathbb{E} \log P(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}|\mathbf{Y}) = -\mathbb{E} \log \frac{P_0(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \exp(H_n(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}))}{Z_n} = H(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) + nF_n - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})]$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{n} I((\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}); \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})] - F_n \tag{14}$$

Compute

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\lambda}{2n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} U_i^2 V_j^2 \right] = \frac{\lambda}{2n} \mathbb{E}[U^2 V^2] + \frac{\lambda(n-1)}{2n} \mathbb{E}[U^2]\mathbb{E}[V^2].$$

We conclude $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} I((\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}); \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E}[U^2]\mathbb{E}[V^2] - \lim_{n\to\infty} F_n$. □

The Replica-Symmetric formula (Theorem 4) allows also to compute the limit of the MMSE.

Proposition 6 (*Limit of the* MMSE)

Let

$$D = \Big\{ \lambda > 0 \;\Big|\; \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \cdot, \cdot) \text{ has a unique maximizer } (q_1^*(\lambda), q_2^*(\lambda)) \text{ over } \Gamma(\lambda) \Big\}.$$

Then D is equal to $(0, +\infty)$ minus a countable set and for all $\lambda \in D$ (and thus almost every $\lambda > 0$)

$$\mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \mathbb{E}[U^2]\mathbb{E}[V^2] - q_1^*(\lambda) q_2^*(\lambda) \tag{15}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\big\langle (\mathbf{u}.\mathbf{U})(\mathbf{v}.\mathbf{V}) \big\rangle \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} q_1^*(\lambda) q_2^*(\lambda) \tag{16}$$

Again, this was conjectured in [25]: the performance of the Bayes-optimal estimator (i.e. the MMSE) corresponds to the fixed point of the state-evolution equations (11) which has the greatest Bethe free energy $\mathcal{F}$. Before proving Proposition 6, we show that the maximizers (q_1^*, q_2^*) of $\mathcal{F}(\lambda, \cdot, \cdot)$ allow us to locate the information-theoretic threshold for our matrix estimation problem. Let us define

$$\lambda_c = \sup \left\{ \lambda \in D \mid q_1^*(\lambda) q_2^*(\lambda) = (\mathbb{E}U)^2 (\mathbb{E}V)^2 \right\}. \tag{17}$$

If the set of the left-hand side is empty, one define $\lambda_c = 0$. We will see that $\lambda_c < \infty$ because of Proposition 7, point (iii). Proposition 6 gives that λ_c is the information-theoretic threshold for the estimation of $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\intercal$ given $\mathbf{Y}$:

- If $\lambda < \lambda_c$, then $\mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}$ DMSE. It is not possible to reconstruct the signal $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\intercal$ better than a "dummy" estimator.
- If $\lambda > \lambda_c$, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) <$ DMSE. It is possible to reconstruct the signal $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\intercal$ better than a "dummy" estimator.

We give now the proof of Proposition 6.

Proof of Proposition 6. Let $\lambda > 0$. Compute, using the Nishimori identity (Proposition 1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{n^2}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{1\le i,j\le n} (U_i V_j - \langle u_i v_j \rangle)^2 \Big] = \frac{1}{n^2}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{1\le i,j\le n} (U_i V_j)^2 + \langle u_i v_j \rangle^2 - 2\langle u_i U_i v_j V_j \rangle \Big] \\
&= \frac{n-1}{n}\mathbb{E}[U^2]\mathbb{E}[V^2] + \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[U^2V^2] - \mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{u}.\mathbf{U})(\mathbf{v}.\mathbf{V}) \Big\rangle \\
&= \frac{n-1}{n}\mathbb{E}[U^2]\mathbb{E}[V^2] + \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[U^2V^2] - 2F_n'(\lambda)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used equation (6) in the last equality. MMSE_n is a non-increasing function of the signal-to-noise ratio λ. Consequently, F_n' is non-decreasing: $\lambda \mapsto F_n(\lambda)$ is convex. Define the function

$$\Phi : \lambda > 0 \mapsto \lim_{n\to\infty} F_n = \sup_{q_1 \ge 0} \left\{ \psi_{P_U}(\lambda q_1) + \inf_{q_2 \ge 0} \left\{ \psi_{P_V}(\lambda q_2) - \frac{\lambda q_1 q_2}{2} \right\} \right\} \tag{18}$$

The infimum does not depend on λ and $\lambda \mapsto \psi_{P_U}(\lambda q_1)$ is differentiable with derivative equal to $\frac{q_1}{2} F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1)$. The supremum is achieved over a compact set, thus an envelope theorem (Corollary 4 from [30]) gives that Φ is differentiable at $\lambda > 0$ if and only if

$$\left\{ \frac{q_1}{2} F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1) \;\middle|\; q_1 \text{ maximizes the right-hand side of (18)} \right\}$$

is a singleton. By monotonicity of F_{P_U}, one see that Φ is differentiable at λ if and only if there is only one couple $(q_1, q_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$ that achieves the extrema in (13). Therefore, the set of point at with Φ is differentiable is exactly D and for all $\lambda \in D$:

$$\Phi'(\lambda) = \frac{q_1^*(\lambda) F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1^*)}{2} = \frac{q_1^*(\lambda) q_2^*(\lambda)}{2} \tag{19}$$

Φ is convex (as a limit of convex functions) and is thus differentiable everywhere except a countable set. This proves the first assertion. By convexity of F_n and Φ, we have by a standard analysis lemma that for all $\lambda \in D$, $F_n'(\lambda) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \Phi'(\lambda)$. The lemma follows. □

Proposition 7 (*Properties of* $q^*(\lambda)$)

(i) The functions $\lambda \in D \mapsto q_1^*(\lambda)$ *and* $\lambda \in D \mapsto q_2^*(\lambda)$ *are non-decreasing.*

(ii) $q_1^*(\lambda) \xrightarrow[\substack{\lambda \in D \\ \lambda \to 0}]{} \mathbb{E}[V]^2$ *and* $q_2^*(\lambda) \xrightarrow[\substack{\lambda \in D \\ \lambda \to 0}]{} \mathbb{E}[U]^2$.

(iii) $q_1^*(\lambda) \xrightarrow[\substack{\lambda \in D \\ \lambda \to +\infty}]{} \mathbb{E}[V^2]$ *and* $q_2^*(\lambda) \xrightarrow[\substack{\lambda \in D \\ \lambda \to +\infty}]{} \mathbb{E}[U^2]$.

Proof. We start by proving (i). Let $\lambda, \lambda' \in D$ such that $\lambda > \lambda'$. In order to shorten the notations, we will denote $(q_1, q_2) = (q_1^*(\lambda), q_2^*(\lambda))$ and $(q_1', q_2') = (q_1^*(\lambda'), q_2^*(\lambda'))$. The convexity of Φ and equation (19) give $q_1 q_2 \geq q_1' q_2'$. Without loss of generalities we can assume that $q_1 \geq q_1'$. The monotonicity of F_{P_U} gives that $q_2 \geq q_2'$. This proves (i).

To prove (ii) we remark that, by Lemma 39 (v) and the definition of $\Gamma(\lambda)$, $q_1^*(\lambda)$ and $q_2^*(\lambda)$ are bounded independently of λ: thus $\lambda q_1^*(\lambda), \lambda q_2^*(\lambda) \xrightarrow[\lambda \to 0]{} 0$. Lemma 39 (vi) imply

$$q_1^*(\lambda) = F_{P_V}(\lambda q_2^*(\lambda)) \xrightarrow[\lambda \to 0]{} (\mathbb{E}V)^2$$
$$q_2^*(\lambda) = F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1^*(\lambda)) \xrightarrow[\lambda \to 0]{} (\mathbb{E}U)^2$$

It remains to prove (iii). By symmetry between u and v, we only have to prove $q_2^*(\lambda) \xrightarrow[\lambda \to \infty]{} \mathbb{E}[U^2]$. By Lemma 39 we have $F_{P_U}(\gamma) \xrightarrow[\gamma \to \infty]{} \mathbb{E}[U^2]$. $\lambda \mapsto q_1^*(\lambda)$ is non-decreasing, therefore we only have to show that $q_1^*(\lambda) > 0$ for some $\lambda \in D$. Suppose that $\forall \lambda \in D$, $q_1^*(\lambda) = 0$.

We have for all $\lambda \in D$, $0 = q_1^*(\lambda) = F_{P_V}(\lambda q_2^*(\lambda))$. This imply that $\forall \lambda \in D$, $q_2^*(\lambda) = 0$ because of point (iv) of Lemma 39. Therefore, $\forall \lambda \in D$, $\sup_{q \in \Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2) = 0$. We are going to show that this leads to a contradiction.

By Lemma 3, there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > \lambda_0$ we can find $(q_1(\lambda), q_2(\lambda)) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$ such that $q_1(\lambda), q_2(\lambda) > \eta$. By convexity of ψ_{P_U} and ψ_{P_V}, we have, for all $\lambda > \lambda_0$

$$\psi_{P_U}(\lambda q_1(\lambda)) \geq \psi_{P_U}\left(\frac{\lambda}{4} q_1(\lambda)\right) + \frac{3}{8}\lambda q_1(\lambda) F_{P_U}\left(\frac{\lambda}{4} q_1(\lambda)\right)$$
$$\psi_{P_V}(\lambda q_2(\lambda)) \geq \psi_{P_V}\left(\frac{\lambda}{4} q_2(\lambda)\right) + \frac{3}{8}\lambda q_2(\lambda) F_{P_V}\left(\frac{\lambda}{4} q_2(\lambda)\right)$$

Therefore, for $\lambda > \lambda_0$

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1(\lambda), q_2(\lambda)) \geq \frac{3}{8}\left(q_1(\lambda) F_{P_U}\left(\frac{\lambda}{4} q_1(\lambda)\right) + q_2(\lambda) F_{P_V}\left(\frac{\lambda}{4} q_2(\lambda)\right)\right) - \frac{1}{2} q_1(\lambda) q_2(\lambda)$$

Using point (vii) from Lemma 39, the right-hand side converges to

$$\frac{3}{8}\left(\mathbb{E}V^2 \mathbb{E}U^2 + \mathbb{E}U^2 \mathbb{E}V^2\right) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}V^2 \mathbb{E}U^2 = \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{E}V^2 \mathbb{E}U^2 > 0$$

This implies that $\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \sup_{(q_1, q_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2) = +\infty$, which is a contradiction. (iii) is proved. □

Corollary 8

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow[\lambda \to 0]{} \mathbb{E}[U^2 V^2] - (\mathbb{E}V)^2 (\mathbb{E}U)^2 = \mathrm{DMSE}$$
$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow[\lambda \to \infty]{} 0$$

2.5 Numerical experiments

In this section we illustrate our results with numerical experiment: we compute the MMSE for different priors and noise levels. For simplicity, we will considers priors for U and V with zero mean, unit variance and with 2 values in their support. Therefore

$$U \sim p_u \delta\left(\sqrt{\frac{1-p_u}{p_u}}\right) + (1-p_u)\delta\left(-\sqrt{\frac{p_u}{1-p_u}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad V \sim p_v \delta\left(\sqrt{\frac{1-p_v}{p_v}}\right) + (1-p_v)\delta\left(-\sqrt{\frac{p_v}{1-p_v}}\right)$$

where $0 < p_u, p_v < 1$ characterize the asymmetry of the priors. We will first compare the performance of PCA with the MMSE. The results of [8] mentioned in the introduction give:

$$\mathrm{MSE}_n^{\mathrm{PCA}} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{\lambda}(1-\frac{1}{\lambda}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We compute the MMSE using Proposition 6 and obtain



(a) Symmetric priors: $p_u = p_v = 1/2$ **(b)** Asymmetric priors: $p_u = p_v = 0.1$

Figure 1: Sub-optimality of PCA for symmetric and asymmetric priors.

For the symmetric case, we see that PCA achieves a non-trivial performance as soon it is information-theoretically possible to estimate the signal ($\lambda > 1$). It is however sub-optimal. In the asymmetric case, the information-theoretic threshold λ_c is strictly below 1. Thus, for $\lambda_c < \lambda < 1$, it is theoretically possible to achieve a non trivial performance but PCA fails. It is conjectured that any polynomial-time algorithm would fail in this regime (see for instance [27]).

The asymmetry of the prior plays therefore a major role in our estimation problem. We will now keep λ constant and let p_u and p_v vary (Figure 2).



(a) Same prior for U and V: $p_u = p_v = p$ **(b)** Different priors: $p_u = p$, $p_v = 1/2$

Figure 2: Influence of the asymmetry of the priors ($\lambda = 0.95$).

Figure 2 shows that when the priors become asymmetric enough, it suddenly becomes possible to make a

non-trivial estimation. Moreover, the MMSE can be arbitrary small with a sufficient asymmetry. We see on Figure 2 (a) that the overlaps q_u^* and q_v^* are equal: the estimation performance will thus be the same for the vector $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$. However, when only the prior on U is asymmetric, we observe on Figure 2 (b) that it will be possible to estimate $\mathbf{U}$ almost perfectly, whereas the performance for estimating $\mathbf{V}$ will be significantly worst. As a result, the MMSE will not go to 0 as $p \to 0$.

2.6 Algorithmic interpretation: Approximate Message Passing (AMP)

Approximate Message Passing (AMP) algorithms, introduced in [12], have been widely used to study the matrix factorization problem (2). They have been used in [36] for the rank-one case and then in [28] for finite-rank matrix estimation. For detailed review and developments about the study of matrix factorization with message-passing algorithms, see [27].

We introduce briefly the AMP algorithm and comment its connections with the results of the previous sections. More details about the algorithm and numerical experiments can be found in [11] and [24]. We would not give any proof about AMP, but the results presented here can be deduced from [19] and the previously mentioned articles.

The scalar channel presented in Section 2.3 holds a key role in the AMP algorithm. Suppose that we observed Y_u and Y_v that are noisy observation of respectively U and V through the scalar channel (7) with signal intensities γ_u and γ_v. The best predictions that we can make (in term of mean square error) for U and V are respectively

$$f_u(Y_u, \gamma_u) = \mathbb{E}[U|Y_U] = \langle u \rangle_{\gamma_u} \tag{20}$$
$$f_v(Y_v, \gamma_v) = \mathbb{E}[V|Y_V] = \langle v \rangle_{\gamma_v} \tag{21}$$

The performance of these estimators is measured by F_{P_U} and F_{P_V}. Indeed $F_{P_U}(\gamma_u) = \mathbb{E}[U f_u(Y_u, \gamma_u)]$ and $F_{P_V}(\gamma_v) = \mathbb{E}[V f_v(Y_v, \gamma_v)]$ measure the correlations between the estimators f_u and f_v and the true values U and V. Define $(q_u^0, q_v^0) = (0, 0)$ and $(q_u^t, q_v^t)_{t \geq 1}$ through the following recursion, called "state evolution":

$$\begin{cases} q_u^{t+1} &= F_{P_U}(\lambda q_v^t) \\ q_v^{t+1} &= F_{P_V}(\lambda q_u^t) \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

The AMP algorithm initializes two estimates of $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ by setting $(\hat{u}_i^0, \hat{v}_i^0)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P_0$ and follows the recursion

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}^{t+1} &= \mathbf{Y}\hat{\mathbf{v}}^t - \delta_u^t \hat{\mathbf{u}}^t \\ \mathbf{v}^{t+1} &= \mathbf{Y}^\intercal \hat{\mathbf{u}}^t - \delta_v^t \hat{\mathbf{v}}^t \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{t+1} &= f_u(\mathbf{u}^{t+1}, \lambda q_v^t) \\ \hat{\mathbf{v}}^{t+1} &= f_v(\mathbf{v}^{t+1}, \lambda q_u^t) \end{cases}$$

where we extend the functions f_u and f_v to vector inputs by applying them coordinate by coordinate. The scalars δ_u^t and δ_v^t are linked to the partial derivatives of the functions $f_u(\cdot, \lambda q_v^t)$ and $f_v(\cdot, \lambda q_u^t)$:

$$\delta_u^t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial u}(\hat{u}_i, \lambda q_v^t), \qquad \delta_v^t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f_v}{\partial v}(\hat{v}_i, \lambda q_u^t)$$

After t iterations, the algorithm outputs $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^t (\hat{\mathbf{v}}^t)^\intercal$. The AMP is particularly interesting because its evolution can be rigorously tracked (see [19]). For $t \geq 1$, we have almost-surely

$$\mathbf{U}.\hat{\mathbf{u}}^t \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} q_u^t, \quad \mathbf{V}.\hat{\mathbf{v}}^t \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} q_v^t \quad \text{and} \quad \text{MSE}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^t (\hat{\mathbf{v}}^t)^\intercal) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} \mathbb{E}[U^2]\mathbb{E}[V^2] - q_u^t q_v^t$$

The state evolution (22) characterizes therefore the behavior of the AMP algorithm. We see that if $(q_u^t, q_v^t)_t$ converges to the "good" fixed point $(q_1^*(\lambda), q_2^*(\lambda))$ of the state evolution, the AMP algorithm is an optimal, polynomial-time algorithm. However, when this is not the case, the AMP algorithm can not be used anymore to compute the MMSE. One needs to use more sophisticated techniques like "spatial coupling" that forces AMP to converge to the good fixed point, see for instance [5] and [4].

The AMP algorithm is however conjectured to be the most efficient polynomial-time algorithm, even in the regime where it does not find the good fixed point. In some sense, the AMP algorithm "mimics" the behavior of the system distributed following the Gibbs measure $\langle \cdot \rangle$. Indeed, we will see that the system satisfies the state evolution equations (22) (see Proposition 20 and Corollary 21).

3 Proof technique

Our proof technique is closely related to [23] that deals with symmetric matrices. It adapts two techniques that originated from the study of the SK model:

- A lower bound on limit of the free energy follows from an application of Guerra's interpolation technique for the SK model (see [15] or [33]).
- The converse upper bound is proved (as in [23]) via cavity computations, inspired from the "Aizenman-Sims-Starr scheme" (see [1] or [33]).

The transposition of these arguments to the context of Bayesian inference is made possible by the obvious but fundamental Nishimori identity (Proposition 1) which states that the planted configuration $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ behaves like a sample $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ from the posterior distribution $\mathbb{P}\big((\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = \cdot \mid \mathbf{Y}\big)$.

However, our inference model differs from the SK model in a crucial point. Under a small perturbation of the model (2), the overlap between the planted solution $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ and a sample $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ from the posterior distribution concentrates around its mean (such behavior is called "Replica-Symmetric" in statistical physics). This property is verified for a wide class of inference problems and is a major difference with the SK model, where the overlap concentrates only at high temperature.

Our model differs also from the SK model and the low-rank symmetric matrix estimation by a lack of convexity. The Hamiltonian of the SK model is a Gaussian process $(H_n(\sigma))_\sigma$ indexed by the configurations $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ whose covariance structure is given by $\mathbb{E}[H_n(\sigma^{(1)})H_n(\sigma^{(2)})] = nR_{1,2}^2$, where $R_{1,2} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^{(1)}\sigma_i^{(2)}$ is the overlap between the configurations $\sigma^{(1)}$ and $\sigma^{(2)}$. The covariance is thus a convex function of the overlap $R_{1,2}$. This property is fundamental and allows to use the powerful Guerra's interpolation technique [15] to derive bounds on the free energy. The low-rank symmetric matrix estimation setting ($\mathbf{Y} = \sqrt{\lambda/n}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\intercal + \mathbf{Z}$) enjoys analogous convexity properties and Guerra's interpolation scheme allows to obtain tight bounds on the free energy as proved in [22] and [20]. However, these convexity properties does not holds in our case of non-symmetric matrix estimation and Guerra's interpolation strategy can not be directly applied.

For this reason one has to investigate further the overlap distribution to by-pass this lack of convexity. We mentioned above that the overlaps concentrates around their means. We will show in Section 5.1 that these mean values satisfies asymptotically fixed point equations. These equations are related to the TAP equations for the SK model (see [38], [37]) and are called "state evolution equations" in the study of Approximate Message Passing (AMP) algorithms (see Section 2.6 and [19]). Combining these state evolution equations to the classical Guerra's interpolation scheme allows to derive a tight lower bound.

4 Overlap concentration

We prove in Section 4.1 a general concentration result for the overlap between a replica (i.e. a sample from a posterior distribution) and the planted solution, for a large class of inference problems. This is made possible by a small perturbation of the inference channel. This is the analogue of the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities (see for instance [33]) for the SK model: the proof will thus be closely related to the derivation of the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities from [33]. In the context of Bayesian inference, a similar result was proved in [21] for the case of CDMA systems with binary inputs.

In Section 4.2 we apply the general concentration result from Section 4.1 to the matrix estimation problem (2).

4.1 General result

Let P_1 be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with bounded support $S \subset [-K_1, K_1]^n$, for some $K_1 > 0$. Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sim P_1$. Let $\mathbf{Y}$ be a random vector (that corresponds a noisy observation of $\mathbf{X}$).

Suppose that the distribution of $\mathbf{X}$ given $\mathbf{Y}$ takes the following form

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{1}{Z_n(\mathbf{Y})} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in A} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) e^{H_n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y})}, \quad \text{for all Borel set } A \subset \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where H_n is a measurable function on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ that can be equal to $-\infty$ (in that case, we use the convention $\exp(-\infty) = 0$) and such that the normalizing constant $Z_n(\mathbf{Y}) = \int_{\mathbf{x} \in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) e^{H_n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y})}$ verifies $\mathbb{E}|Z_n(\mathbf{Y})| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}|\log(Z_n(\mathbf{Y}))| < \infty$. Define the free energy

$$F_n = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log Z_n(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log\left(\int_{\mathbf{x} \in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) e^{H_n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y})}\right).$$

Because of the integrability condition on $Z_n(\mathbf{Y})$, F_n is finite. We are going to add now a small perturbation to this model. Let $a \in [1/2, 3]$ and $(s_n)_n \in (0,1]^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let $(z_i)_{1\leq i\leq n} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ independently of everything else. Define the perturbed Hamiltonian:

$$H_n^{(\text{pert})}(\mathbf{x}) = H_n(\mathbf{x}) + h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x})$$

where

$$h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a\sqrt{s_n} z_i x_i + a^2 s_n x_i X_i - \frac{1}{2} a^2 s_n x_i^2$$

Let $\langle \cdot \rangle$ be the measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ defined as

$$\langle f(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = \frac{\int_{\mathbf{x}\in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(H_n^{(\text{pert})}(\mathbf{x}))}{\int_{\mathbf{x}\in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) \exp(H_n^{(\text{pert})}(\mathbf{x}))} \tag{23}$$

for every continuous bounded function f. $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is well defined. Indeed, by integrating with respect to the variables $(z_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ first: $\mathbb{E}[\int_{\mathbf{x}\in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) \exp(H_n^{(\text{pert})}(\mathbf{x}))] \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_n(\mathbf{Y})] e^{na^2 s_n K_0^2} < \infty$. Notice that $\langle \cdot \rangle$ corresponds to the distribution of $\mathbf{X}$ given $\mathbf{Y}$ and the observations $(y_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ given by:

$$y_i = a\sqrt{s_n} X_i + z_i, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n. \tag{24}$$

Thus, the Nishimori identity (Proposition 1) will be valid under $\langle \cdot \rangle$. We also define the free energy of the perturbed model

$$F_n^{(\text{pert})} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \log \left(\int_{\mathbf{x}\in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) e^{H_n^{(\text{pert})}(\mathbf{x})} \right)$$

We will assume $s_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$. This implies that the perturbation does not change asymptotically the free energy:

Lemma 9

If $s_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$, then $\left|F_n - F_n^{(\text{pert})}\right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$ uniformly in $a \in [1/2, 3]$ and consequently

$$\left|F_n - \int_1^2 F_n^{(pert)} da\right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Proof. Let $\langle \cdot \rangle_n$ denote the measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ defined as $\langle f(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_n = \frac{\int_{\mathbf{x}\in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(H_n(\mathbf{x}))}{\int_{\mathbf{x}\in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) \exp(H_n(\mathbf{x}))}$ for every continuous bounded function f. We have

$$F_n^{(\text{pert})} - F_n = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \log \langle e^{h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x})} \rangle_n$$

Thus, using Jensen's inequality twice

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \langle \mathbb{E}_z h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_n = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \langle h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_n \leq F_n^{(\text{pert})} - F_n \leq \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \log \mathbb{E}_z \langle e^{h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x})} \rangle_n = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \log \langle \mathbb{E}_z e^{h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x})} \rangle_n$$

where $\mathbb{E}_z$ denotes the expectation with respect to the variables $(z_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ only. We have, for all $\mathbf{x} \in S^n$, $|\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_z h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x})| \leq 2K_1^2 a^2 s_n$ and $|\mathbb{E}_z e^{h_{n,a}(\mathbf{x})}| \leq e^{2K_1^2 a^2 s_n}$. Consequently, $s_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$ implies that $|F_n - F_n^{(\text{pert})}|$ goes to 0 uniformly in $a \in [1/2, 3]$. The lemma follows. □

Let us define

$$\phi : a \mapsto \frac{1}{n s_n} \log \left(\int_{\mathbf{x}\in S} dP_1(\mathbf{x}) e^{H_n^{(\text{pert})}(\mathbf{x})} \right).$$

Define also $v_n(s_n) = \sup_{1/2\leq a\leq 3} \mathbb{E}|\phi(a) - \mathbb{E}\phi(a)|$. The following result shows that, in the perturbed system, under some conditions on v_n and s_n, the overlap between two replicas concentrates asymptotically around its expected value.

Theorem 10 (*Overlap concentration*)

Suppose that

$$\begin{cases} v_n(s_n) & \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \\ ns_n & \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} +\infty \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \big(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)} - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)}\rangle\big)^2 \Big\rangle da \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

where $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(2)}$ are two independent replicas sampled from $\langle\cdot\rangle$ (see equation 23).

In order to prove Theorem 10 we will need the following lemma. Denote for $\mathbf{x} \in S^n$

$$L(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_n}} z_i x_i + 2a x_i X_i - a x_i^2$$

Lemma 11

Under the conditions of Theorem 10,

$$\int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \big|L(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}\langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle\big| \Big\rangle da \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Proof. ϕ is twice differentiable on $[1/2, 3]$, and for $a \in [1/2, 3]$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(a) &= \langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle \\ \phi''(a) &= n s_n \big(\langle L(\mathbf{x})^2\rangle - \langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle^2\big) + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \langle 2x_i X_i - x_i^2\rangle \\ \mathbb{E}\phi'(a) &= 2a\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{x}.\mathbf{X}\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\langle (L(\mathbf{x}) - \langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle)^2\rangle \le \frac{1}{n s_n}(\phi''(a) + 2K_1^2)$ and

$$\int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\big\langle (L(\mathbf{x}) - \langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle)^2\big\rangle da \le \frac{1}{n s_n}(\mathbb{E}\phi'(2) - \mathbb{E}\phi'(1) + 2K_1^2) = O(n^{-1}s_n^{-1})$$

Hence $\int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\big\langle |L(\mathbf{x}) - \langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle|\big\rangle da \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$. It remains to show that $\int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\big|\langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle\big| da \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$.

We will use the following lemma on convex functions (from [33], lemma 3.2).

Lemma 12

If f and g are two differentiable convex functions then, for any $b > 0$

$$|f'(a) - g'(a)| \le g'(a+b) - g'(a-b) + \frac{d}{b}$$

where $d = |f(a+b) - g(a+b)| + |f(a-b) - g(a-b)| + |f(a) - g(a)|$.

We apply this lemma to $\lambda \mapsto \phi(\lambda) + K_1^2\lambda^2$ and $\lambda \mapsto \mathbb{E}\phi(\lambda) + K_1^2\lambda^2$ for $a \in [1,2]$ and $b \in (0, 1/2)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi'(a) - \mathbb{E}\phi'(a)| \le \mathbb{E}\phi'(a+b) - \mathbb{E}\phi'(a-b) + 4K_1^2 b + \frac{3v_n(s_n)}{b} \tag{25}$$

Notice that for all $a \in [1/2, 3]$, $|\mathbb{E}\phi'(a)| = |2a\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{x}.\mathbf{X}\rangle| \le 6K_1^2$. Therefore, by the mean value theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^2 (\mathbb{E}\phi'(a+b) - \mathbb{E}\phi'(a-b))da &= (\mathbb{E}\phi(b+2) - \mathbb{E}\phi(b+1)) - (\mathbb{E}\phi(2-b) - \mathbb{E}\phi(1-b)) \\ &= (\mathbb{E}\phi(b+2) - \mathbb{E}\phi(2-b)) + (\mathbb{E}\phi(1-b) - \mathbb{E}\phi(1+b)) \\ &\le 24K_1^2 b \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with equation (25), we obtain

$$\forall b \in (0, 1/2], \quad \int_1^2 \mathbb{E}|\phi'(a) - \mathbb{E}\phi'(a)|da \leq C(b + \frac{v_n(s_n)}{b}) \tag{26}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on K_1. The infimum of the right-hand side is achieved for $b = \sqrt{v_n(s_n)} < 1/2$ for n large enough. Then, (26) gives

$$\int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\big|\langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle L(\mathbf{x})\rangle\big|da = \int_1^2 \mathbb{E}|\phi'(a) - \mathbb{E}\phi'(a)|da \leq C\sqrt{v_n(s_n)} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

□

We are now in measure to prove Theorem 10. The overlap between two replicas is bounded by K_1^2, thus

$$\int_1^2 \Big|\mathbb{E}\langle L(\mathbf{x}^{(1)})\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)}\rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)}\rangle\mathbb{E}\langle L(\mathbf{x}^{(1)})\rangle\Big|da \leq K_1^2 \int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \big|L(x) - \mathbb{E}\langle L(x)\rangle\big|\Big\rangle da \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

By Gaussian integration by parts and using the Nishimori identity (Proposition 1) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)}\rangle\mathbb{E}\langle L(\mathbf{x}^{(1)})\rangle = 2a(\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)}\rangle)^2.$$

Using the same tools, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\langle L(\mathbf{x}^{(1)})(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)})\rangle &= 2a\mathbb{E}\langle(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{X})(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)})\rangle + \frac{1}{n\sqrt{s_n}}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}z_i\langle x_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)})\rangle - \frac{a}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\langle (x_i^{(1)})^2(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)})\rangle \\
&= 2a\mathbb{E}\langle(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{X})(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)})\rangle + a\mathbb{E}\langle(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)})^2\rangle - a\mathbb{E}\langle(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(3)} + \mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(4)})(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)})\rangle \\
&= 2a\mathbb{E}\langle(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)})^2\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the result.

4.2 Application to matrix factorization

In this section we apply the results of the previous section to our model (2). As we will see in the proof of Theorem 4 (see Section 5), we will need to consider a (slightly) more general inference problem. Let $q_u, q_v \geq 0$, $(U_i, V_i)_{1\leq i\leq n} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P_0$, and suppose that we observe

$$Y_{i,j} = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}U_iV_j + Z_{i,j}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq n \tag{27}$$

$$Y_i^{(u)} = \sqrt{q_u\lambda}U_i + Z_i^{(u)}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n \tag{28}$$

$$Y_i^{(v)} = \sqrt{q_v\lambda}V_i + Z_i^{(v)}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n \tag{29}$$

where $Z_i^{(u)}, Z_i^{(v)} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, are independent of everything else. Recall the expression of the Hamiltonian H_n

$$H_n(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{1\leq i,j\leq n} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}u_iv_jZ_{i,j} + \frac{\lambda}{n}u_iU_iv_jV_j - \frac{\lambda}{2n}u_i^2v_j^2, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in S^n \tag{30}$$

and define the Hamiltonian $H_n^{(s)}$ corresponding to channels (28) and (29):

$$H_n^{(s)}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\lambda q_u}u_iZ_i^{(u)} + \lambda q_uu_iU_i - \frac{\lambda q_u}{2}u_i^2 + \sqrt{\lambda q_v}v_iZ_i^{(v)} + \lambda q_vv_iV_i - \frac{\lambda q_v}{2}v_i^2 \tag{31}$$

In order to obtain a concentration result for both overlaps $\mathbf{u}.\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{v}.\mathbf{V}$, we define two perturbation Hamiltonians. Let $(z_i^{(u)})_{1\leq i\leq n}, (z_i^{(v)})_{1\leq i\leq n}$ be independent standard Gaussian random variables, independent of everything else and define, for $a_u, a_v \in [1/2, 3]$ and $(s_n)_n \in (0,1]^{\mathbb{N}}$

$$H_{n,u}^{(\text{pert})}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{s_n}a_uz_i^{(u)}u_i + s_na_u^2u_iU_i - \frac{s_na_u^2}{2}u_i^2, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in S^n$$

$$H_{n,v}^{(\text{pert})}(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{s_n}a_vz_i^{(v)}v_i + s_na_v^2v_iV_i - \frac{s_na_v^2}{2}v_i^2, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{v} \in S^n.$$

We write, for $\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v} \in S^n$, $H_n^{(\mathrm{pert})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = H_{n,u}^{(\mathrm{pert})}(\mathbf{u}) + H_{n,v}^{(\mathrm{pert})}(\mathbf{v})$ and define the "total" Hamiltonian as $H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})} = H_n + H_n^{(s)} + H_n^{(\mathrm{pert})}$. Let $\langle\cdot\rangle_n$ be the associated Gibbs measure on $(S^n)^2$:

$$\big\langle f(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\big\rangle_n = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) e^{H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}}{\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) e^{H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}}, \quad \text{for any function } f \text{ on } (S^n)^2.$$

Define, similarly as in the previous section

$$\phi : (a_u,a_v) \mapsto \frac{1}{ns_n}\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) e^{H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad v_n(s_n) = \sup_{1/2\le a_u,a_v\le 3} \mathbb{E}|\phi(a_u,a_v) - \mathbb{E}\phi(a_u,a_v)|.$$

Lemma 13

$$v_n(s_n) = O(n^{-1/2}s_n^{-1})$$

Proof. We split $H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}$ in two parts. Define, for $\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v} \in S^n$

$$h_1(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i,j}\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}} u_i v_j Z_{i,j} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\lambda q_u} Z_i^{(u)} u_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\lambda q_v} Z_i^{(v)} v_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{s_n} a_u z_i^{(u)} u_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{s_n} a_v z_i^{(v)} v_i$$

$$h_2(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) - h_1(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})$$

We are going to use the following concentration result from [33] (Theorem 1.2).

Theorem 14 (*[33], Theorem 1.2*)

Consider a countable set Σ and some finite measure G on it. Consider the quantity

$$X = \log\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma}\exp(g(\sigma))G(\sigma)$$

where $(g(\sigma))_\sigma$ is a Gaussian process such that for some constant $\alpha > 0$ we have

$$\forall\sigma\in\Sigma,\ \mathbb{E}g(\sigma)^2 \le \alpha$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X - \mathbb{E}X)^2 \le 8\alpha$$

We apply here this theorem conditionally to $(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V})$. Consider $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ to be fixed and apply Theorem 14 with $\Sigma = (S^n)^2$, $G(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(h_2(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))$ and $g = h_1$. Let $\mathbb{E}_z$ denote the expectation with respect to the Gaussian variables $\mathbf{Z}$, $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$, $\mathbf{Z}^{(v)}$, $\mathbf{z}^{(u)}$ and $\mathbf{z}^{(v)}$. For $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \in S^n\times S^n$ and all $a_u,a_v\in[1/2,3]$

$$\mathbb{E}_z\big[h_1(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})^2\big] \le Cn(1+s_n) \le 2C_0 n$$

for some constant C_0 depending only on λ, q_u, q_v and K_0. Therefore, by Theorem 14, for all values of $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ and all $a_u,a_v\in[1/2,3]$

$$\mathbb{E}_z\big(ns_n\phi(a_u,a_v) - \mathbb{E}_z[ns_n\phi(a_u,a_v)]\big)^2 \le 16C_0 n$$

Therefore $\mathbb{E}|\phi(a_u,a_v) - \mathbb{E}_z[\phi(a_u,a_v)]| \le 4C_0^{1/2}n^{-1/2}s_n^{-1}$.

Now we are going to show that $E_z[ns_n\phi(a_u,a_v)]$ concentrates around its expectation (with respect to $\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V}$). $E_z[ns_n\phi(a_u,a_v)]$ can be seen as a function of $(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V})$. We can easily verify that this function has "the bounded differences property" (see [9], section 3.2) because $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ have bounded support. Then Corollary 3.2 from [9] (which is a consequence of the Efron-Stein inequality) gives, for all $a_u,a_v\in[1/2,3]$

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}_z[ns_n\phi(a_u,a_v)] - \mathbb{E}[ns_n\phi(a_u,a_v)])^2 \le C_1 n$$

for some constant C_1 depending only on λ, q_u, q_v and K_0. We conclude

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi(a_u,a_v) - \mathbb{E}\phi(a_u,a_v)| \le (4C_0^{1/2} + C_1^{1/2})n^{-1/2}s_n^{-1}.$$

□

Proposition 15

Define $s_n = n^{-1/4}$, then

$$\int_1^2 \int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle)^2 \Big\rangle_n da_u da_v \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \tag{32}$$

$$\int_1^2 \int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle)^2 \Big\rangle_n da_u da_v \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \tag{33}$$

Proof. We remark that the proof we gave of Theorem 10 remains valid if one consider the overlap of only the first half of the components of the replicas (with a perturbation involving only the first half of the components of $\mathbf{X}$). The choice of s_n implies

$$\begin{cases} v_n(s_n) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \\ n s_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} +\infty \end{cases}$$

Let $a_u \in [1,2]$. We apply now Theorem 10 to the Hamiltonian $H_n + H_n^{(s)} + H_{n,u}^{(\text{pert})} + \log P_0$. We obtain

$$\int_1^2 \mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle)^2 \Big\rangle_n da_v \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

where $\langle\cdot\rangle$ denote the Gibbs measure corresponding to the Hamiltonian $\log P_0 + H_n^{(\text{tot})}$. Integrating with respect to a_u over $[1,2]$ gives (33). By symmetry between u and v, we obtain (32). □

In the following, s_n will be equal to $n^{-1/4}$. It will also be convenient to consider a_u and a_v as random variables. Suppose that $(a_u, a_v) \sim \mathcal{U}([1,2]^2)$ and denote $\mathbb{E}_a$ the expectation with respect to (a_u, a_v). We can then rewrite the result of Proposition 15 as

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle)^2 \Big\rangle_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \tag{34}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle)^2 \Big\rangle_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \tag{35}$$

5 Proof of the Replica-Symmetric formula (Theorem 4)

The proof of Theorem 4 is divided in three steps. In Section 5.1, we show that the overlaps satisfy asymptotically some fixed point equations. In Section 5.2, we prove a lower bound for the limit of F_n by combining this fixed point equations with Guerra's interpolation strategy. In Section 5.3, we use similar arguments as in [23] to obtain an upper bound on the limit, which will be revealed to be tight in Section 5.4.

5.1 Fixed point equations

We have seen (in Proposition 15) that the overlaps $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}$ and $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}$ concentrates asymptotically around their expectations (under a small perturbation of the model). In this section, we show that these expected values satisfy fixed point equations, in the $n \to \infty$ limit. The analysis is an adaptation of the derivation of the TAP equations for the SK model, see [37].

To obtain these fixed point equations, we are going to do what physicists call "cavity computations": we compare the system with $2n$ variables to the system with $2n+2$ variables to study the influence of the "first" $2n$ variables on the 2 "last" variables we add.

Let $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \in S^{n+1} \times S^{n+1}$ and decompose $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = (\mathbf{u}, u')$, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = (\mathbf{v}, v')$ where $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in S^n$ and $u', v' \in S$. We will use the short notations $U' = U_{n+1}$ and $V' = V_{n+1}$. We decompose the Hamiltonian

$$H_{n+1}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) = H'_n(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + h_u(\mathbf{v}, u') + h_v(\mathbf{u}, v') + \delta(u', v')$$

where

$$H'_n(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n+1}} u_i v_j Z_{i,j} + \frac{\lambda}{n+1} u_i U_i v_j V_j - \frac{\lambda}{2(n+1)} u_i^2 v_j^2$$

$$h_u(\mathbf{v},u') = \sum_{j=1}^{n} u' \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n+1}} Z_{n+1,j} v_j + u'U' \frac{\lambda}{n+1} v_j V_j - u'^2 \frac{\lambda}{2(n+1)} v_j^2$$

$$h_v(\mathbf{u},v') = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v' \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n+1}} Z_{i,n+1} u_i + v'V' \frac{\lambda}{n+1} u_i U_i - v'^2 \frac{\lambda}{2(n+1)} u_i^2$$

$$\delta(u',v') = u'v' \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n+1}} Z_{n+1,n+1} + \frac{\lambda}{n+1} u'U'v'V' - \frac{\lambda}{2(n+1)} u'^2 v'^2$$

Similarly, one can decompose the Hamiltonians $H_n^{(s)}$ and $H_{n+1}^{(\mathrm{pert})}$ (defined in Section 4.2):

$$H_{n+1}^{(s)}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}},\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) = H_n^{(s)}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) + g_u(u') + g_v(v')$$

$$H_{n+1}^{(\mathrm{pert})}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}},\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) = H_n^{(\mathrm{pert})\prime}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) + \sqrt{s_{n+1}} a_u z_{n+1}^{(u)} u' + s_{n+1} a_u^2 u'U' - \frac{s_{n+1} a_u^2}{2} u'^2 + \sqrt{s_{n+1}} a_v z_{n+1}^{(v)} v' + s_{n+1} a_v^2 v'V' - \frac{s_{n+1} a_v^2}{2} v'^2$$

where

$$H_n^{(\mathrm{pert})\prime}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{s_{n+1}} a_u z_i^{(u)} u_i + s_{n+1} a_u^2 u_i U_i - \frac{s_{n+1} a_u^2}{2} u_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{s_{n+1}} a_v z_i^{(v)} v_i + s_{n+1} a_v^2 v_i V_i - \frac{s_{n+1} a_v^2}{2} v_i^2$$

$$g_u(u') = \sqrt{\lambda q_u} u' Z_{n+1}^{(u)} + \lambda q_u u'U' - \frac{\lambda q_u}{2} u'^2$$

$$g_v(v') = \sqrt{\lambda q_v} v' Z_{n+1}^{(v)} + \lambda q_v v'V' - \frac{\lambda q_v}{2} v'^2$$

Let us now define $H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})\prime} = H'_n + H_n^{(s)} + H_n^{(\mathrm{pert})\prime}$ and $\langle\cdot\rangle'$ the Gibbs measure on $(S^n)^2$ corresponding to the Hamiltonian $\log P_0 + H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})\prime}$. An easy adaptation of the proof of Proposition 15 gives that the overlaps under the Gibbs measure $\langle\cdot\rangle'$ concentrate around their expectations. Define

$$\begin{aligned} y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) &= H_{n+1}^{(\mathrm{tot})}\big((\mathbf{u},u'),(\mathbf{v},v')\big) - H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})\prime}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \\ &= h_u(\mathbf{v},u') + h_v(\mathbf{u},v') + \delta(u',v') + g_u(u') + g_v(v') \\ &\quad + \sqrt{s_{n+1}} a_u z_{n+1}^{(u)} u' + s_{n+1} a_u^2 u'U' - \frac{s_{n+1} a_u^2}{2} u'^2 + \sqrt{s_{n+1}} a_v z_{n+1}^{(v)} v' + s_{n+1} a_v^2 v'V' - \frac{s_{n+1} a_v^2}{2} v'^2 \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Define the random variables

$$Q'_u = \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^{(1)} u_i^{(2)} \right\rangle' = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle u_i \rangle'^2 \tag{37}$$

$$Q'_v = \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i^{(1)} v_i^{(2)} \right\rangle' = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle v_i \rangle'^2 \tag{38}$$

where $(\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)})$ and $(\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)})$ are two independent replicas sampled from $\langle\cdot\rangle'$. Let $\phi : S^4 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function on S^4. ϕ is bounded because S^4 is a finite set. Define

$$A = \Big\langle \sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') \phi(u',v',U',V') e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})} \Big\rangle', \text{ where } (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \text{ is a replica from } \langle\cdot\rangle',$$

$$B = \sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') \phi(u',v',U',V') \exp(h_0(u',v'))$$

(recall the short notation $U' = U_{n+1}$ and $V' = V_{n+1}$) where

$$\begin{aligned} h_0(u', v') &= u'\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n+1}}Z_{n+1,j}\langle v_j\rangle'\Big) + u'U'\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_v - u'^2\frac{n\lambda}{2(n+1)}Q'_v \\ &+ v'\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n+1}}Z_{i,n+1}\langle u_i\rangle'\Big) + v'V'\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_u - v'^2\frac{n\lambda}{2(n+1)}Q'_u \\ &+ g_u(u') + g_v(v') \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mathbb{E}_a$ denotes the expectation with respect to the perturbation (see the end of Section 4.2).

Lemma 16

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}(A-B)^2 \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Proof. It suffices to prove $\mathbb{E}_a(\mathbb{E}A^2 - \mathbb{E}B^2) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_a(\mathbb{E}AB - \mathbb{E}B^2) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$. We are only going to show the first convergence, the second one can be obtained analogously. We denote by $\mathbb{E}'$ the expectation with respect to the variables $(Z_{i,n+1})_{1\le i\le n+1}$, $(Z_{n+1,j})_{1\le j\le n+1}$, $Z^{(u)}_{n+1}$, $Z^{(v)}_{n+1}$, $z^{(u)}_{n+1}$ and $z^{(v)}_{n+1}$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}'B^2 = \sum_{u'_1,v'_1,u'_2,v'_2\in S} P_0(u'_1,v'_1)P_0(u'_2,v'_2)\phi(u'_1,u'_1,U',V')\phi(u'_2,u'_2,U',V')\mathbb{E}'\big[\exp(h_0(u'_1,v'_1)+h_0(u'_2,v'_2))\big]$$

Using the fact that $\mathbb{E}[e^{xN}] = e^{x^2/2}$ when $N\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)$, we have for $u'_1, v'_1, u'_2, v'_2 \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}'\big[\exp(h_0(u'_1,v'_1)+h_0(u'_2,v'_2))\big] \\ &= \exp\Big(\frac{\lambda}{2(n+1)}(u'_1+u'_2)^2\sum_{j=1}^{n}\langle v_j\rangle'^2 + (u'_1+u'_2)U'\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_v - (u'^2_1+u'^2_2)\frac{n\lambda}{2(n+1)}Q'_v \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{2(n+1)}(v'_1+v'_2)^2\sum_{i=1}^{n}\langle u_i\rangle'^2 + (v'_1+v'_2)V'\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_u - (v'^2_1+v'^2_2)\frac{n\lambda}{2(n+1)}Q'_u \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda q_u}{2}(u'_1+u'_2)^2 + \frac{\lambda q_v}{2}(v'_1+v'_2)^2 + \lambda q_u(u'_1+u'_2)U' + \lambda q_v(v'_1+v'_2)V' - \frac{\lambda q_u}{2}(u'^2_1+u'^2_2) - \frac{\lambda q_v}{2}(v'^2_1+v'^2_2)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions (37) and (38), we have $\sum_{j=1}^{n}\langle v_j\rangle'^2 = nQ'_v$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\langle u_i\rangle'^2 = nQ'_u$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}'\exp\big(h_0(u'_1,v'_1)+h_0(u'_2,v'_2)\big) \\ &\qquad = \exp\Big((\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_v+\lambda q_u)(u'_1u'_2+u'_1U'+u'_2U') + (\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_u+\lambda q_v)(v'_1v'_2+v'_1V'+v'_2V')\Big) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}'[B^2] = \sum_{u'_1,v'_1,u'_2,v'_2\in S} &P_0(u'_1,v'_1)P_0(u'_2,v'_2)\phi(u'_1,u'_1,U',V')\phi(u'_2,u'_2,U',V') \\ &\times\exp\Big((\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_v+\lambda q_u)(u'_1u'_2+u'_1U'+u'_2U') + (\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_u+\lambda q_v)(v'_1v'_2+v'_1V'+v'_2V')\Big) \end{aligned}$$

Let $(\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)})$ and $(\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)})$ be two independent samples from $\langle\cdot\rangle'$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}'[A^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}'\Big\langle \sum_{u'_1,v'_1,u'_2,v'_2} P_0(u'_1,v'_1)P_0(u'_2,v'_2)\phi(u'_1,v'_1,U',V')\phi(u'_2,v'_2,U',V')\exp(y(u'_1,v'_1,\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)})+y(u'_2,v'_2,\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)}))\Big\rangle' \\ &= \Big\langle \sum_{u'_1,v'_1,u'_2,v'_2} P_0(u'_1,v'_1)P_0(u'_2,v'_2)\phi(u'_1,v'_1,U',V')\phi(u'_2,v'_2,U',V')\mathbb{E}'\big[\exp(y(u'_1,v'_1,\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)})+y(u'_2,v'_2,\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)}))\big]\Big\rangle' \end{aligned}$$

because $\mathbb{E}'$ integrates with respect to random variables that are independent of the variables on which $\langle\cdot\rangle'$ depends. We have thus to compute $\mathbb{E}'[\exp(y(u_1',v_1',\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)})+y(u_2',v_2',\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)}))]$. We first compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}'[\exp(h_u(\mathbf{v}^{(1)},u_1')+h_u(\mathbf{v}^{(2)},u_2'))]\\
&=\exp\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\lambda}{2(n+1)}(u_1'v_j^{(1)}+u_2'v_j^{(2)})^2+\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}(u_1'U'\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{V}-\frac{u_1'^2}{2}\|\mathbf{v}^{(1)}\|^2+u_2'U'\mathbf{v}^{(2)}.\mathbf{V}-\frac{u_2'^2}{2}\|\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\|^2)\Big)\\
&=\exp\Big(\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}(u_1'u_2'(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)})+u_1'U'(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{V})+u_2'U'(\mathbf{v}^{(2)}.\mathbf{V}))\Big) \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

By symmetry between u and v,

$$\mathbb{E}'[\exp(h_v(\mathbf{u}^{(1)},v_1')+h_v(\mathbf{u}^{(2)},v_2'))]=\exp\Big(\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}(v_1'v_2'(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)})+v_1'V'(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{U})+v_2'V'(\mathbf{u}^{(2)}.\mathbf{U}))\Big) \qquad (40)$$

One have also, by similar arguments

$$\mathbb{E}'[\exp(g_u(u_1')+g_u(u_2')+g_v(v_1')+g_v(v_2'))]=\exp\Big(\lambda q_u(u_1'u_2'+u_1'U'+u_2'U')+\lambda q_v(v_1'v_2'+v_1'V'+v_2'V')\Big) \qquad (41)$$

and $\mathbb{E}'[e^{\delta(u_1',v_1')+\delta(u_2',v_2')}]=e^{o_n(1)}$, where $o_n(1)$ denote a quantity that goes to 0 as $n\to\infty$, uniformly in u_1',u_2',v_1',v_2'. Bringing equations (39), (40) and (41) together, one obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}'[\exp(y(u_1',v_1',\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)})+y(u_2',v_2',\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)}))]\\
&=\exp\Big(\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}(u_1'u_2'(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)})+u_1'U'(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.V)+u_2'U'(\mathbf{v}^{(2)}.V)+v_1'v_2'(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)})+v_1'V'(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.U)+v_2'V'(\mathbf{u}^{(2)}.U))\Big)\\
&\times\exp\Big(\lambda q_u(u_1'u_2'+u_1'U'+u_2'U')+\lambda q_v(v_1'v_2'+v_1'V'+v_2'V')+o_n(1)\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

Define now the function

$$\begin{aligned}
F:(r_v,s_v^{(1)},s_v^{(2)},r_u,s_u^{(1)},s_u^{(2)},\epsilon)\in[-K_0^2,K_0^2]^6\times[-1,1]\mapsto\\
\sum_{u_1',v_1',u_2',v_2'\in S}P_0(u_1',v_1')P_0(u_2',v_2')\phi(u_1',v_1',U',V')\phi(u_2',v_2',U',V')\\
\times\exp\Big(\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}(u_1'u_2'r_v+u_1'U's_v^{(1)}+u_2'U's_v^{(2)}+v_1'v_2'r_u+v_1'V's_u^{(1)}+v_2'V's_u^{(2)})\Big)\\
\times\exp\Big(\lambda q_u(u_1'u_2'+u_1'U'+u_2'U')+\lambda q_v(v_1'v_2'+v_1'V'+v_2'V')+\epsilon\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

F is a random function (it depends on U' and V') that is $\mathcal{C}^1$ on a compact set. F is thus Lipschitz (with a Lipschitz constant depending on U' and V'). U' and V' are bounded, one see that there exists a constant L_0 such that F is almost surely L_0-Lipschitz. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}'[A^2]&=\Big\langle F(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{V},\mathbf{v}^{(2)}.\mathbf{V},\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{U},\mathbf{u}^{(2)}.\mathbf{U},o_n(1))\Big\rangle'\\
\mathbb{E}'[B^2]&=F(Q_v',Q_v',Q_v',Q_u',Q_u',Q_u',0)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}A^2-\mathbb{E}B^2|\le L_0\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big\langle&(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}-Q_v')^2+(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{V}-Q_v')^2+(\mathbf{v}^{(2)}.\mathbf{V}-Q_v')^2\\
&+(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}-Q_u')^2+(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{U}-Q_u')^2+(\mathbf{u}^{(2)}.\mathbf{U}-Q_u')^2+o_n(1)\Big\rangle'\Big)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

As mentioned above, the overlaps concentrates under the Gibbs measure $\langle\cdot\rangle'$:

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\big\langle(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}-Q_v')^2\big\rangle'\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0\quad\text{and}\quad\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\big\langle(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}-Q_u')^2\big\rangle'\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0.$$

Using the Nishimori identity (Proposition 1), one have also

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\big\langle(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{V}-Q_v')^2\big\rangle'\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0\quad\text{and}\quad\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\big\langle(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{U}-Q_u')^2\big\rangle'\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}_a|\mathbb{E}A^2-\mathbb{E}B^2|\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0$. □

Lemma 17

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\left|\left\langle\phi(u_{n+1},v_{n+1},U_{n+1},V_{n+1})\right\rangle_{n+1}-\frac{\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\phi(u',v',U',V')\exp(h_0(u',v'))}{\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\exp(h_0(u',v'))}\right|\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0$$

Proof. By the definition of y (see equation (36)) we have

$$\left\langle\phi(u_{n+1},v_{n+1},U_{n+1},V_{n+1})\right\rangle_{n+1}=\frac{\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\phi(u',v',U',V')\exp(y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle'}{\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\exp(y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle'}\tag{42}$$

Define

$$R=\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\phi(u',v',U',V')\exp(h_0(u',v'))\ ,\ S=\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\exp(h_0(u',v'))$$
$$R'=\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\phi(u',v',U',V')\exp(y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle'\ ,\ S'=\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\exp(y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle'$$

We have to prove that $\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\left|\frac{R'}{S'}-\frac{R}{S}\right|\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0$. By equation (42) $|\frac{R'}{S'}|\le\|\phi\|_\infty$, therefore

$$\left|\frac{R'}{S'}-\frac{R}{S}\right|=\left|\frac{R'}{S'}\frac{S-S'}{S}+\frac{R'-R}{S}\right|\le\frac{1}{|S|}(\|\phi\|_\infty+1)(|R-R'|+|S-S'|)$$

Thus, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\frac{R'}{S'}-\frac{R}{S}\right|\le(\|\phi\|_\infty+1)\sqrt{\mathbb{E}S^{-2}}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(R-R')^2+\mathbb{E}(S-S')^2}.$$

By Jensen's inequality, one have

$$\mathbb{E}S^{-2}\le\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\exp(-2h_0(u',v'))\right]=\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-2h_0(u',v'))\right]\le e^{10\lambda K_0^4+3\lambda(q_u+q_v)K_0^2}$$

We apply Lemma 16 twice (with $\phi=1$ and "$\phi=\phi$") to obtain $\mathbb{E}_a\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(R-R')^2+\mathbb{E}(S-S')^2}\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0$ which concludes the proof. □

Lemma 18

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}|\langle u_1\rangle_{n+1}-\langle u_1\rangle'|\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0$$

Proof. By the definition of y (see equation (36)) we have

$$\frac{\left\langle(u_1-\langle u_1\rangle')\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right\rangle'}{\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right\rangle'}=\langle u_1\rangle_{n+1}-\langle u_1\rangle'\tag{43}$$

We denote by $\mathbb{E}'$ the expectation with respect to the variables $(Z_{i,n+1})_{1\le i\le n+1}$, $(Z_{n+1,j})_{1\le j\le n+1}$, $Z_{n+1}^{(u)}$, $Z_{n+1}^{(v)}$, $z_{n+1}^{(u)}$ and $z_{n+1}^{(v)}$. We first notice that, using Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right\rangle'\right)^{-2}\right]\le\mathbb{E}\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')e^{-2y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right\rangle'$$
$$\le\mathbb{E}\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S}P_0(u',v')\mathbb{E}'\left[e^{-2y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right]\right\rangle'$$

The bounded support assumption on P_0 gives then that, for all $(u', v') \in S^2$ and $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in S^n$, $\mathbb{E}'\left[e^{-2y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right] \leq C_1$ for some constant C_1. Therefore $\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left\langle \sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})} \right\rangle'\right)^{-2}\right] \leq C_1$. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality applied to the left hand side of equation (43) shows that it suffices to prove

$$\mathbb{E}_a \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left\langle (u_1 - \langle u_1 \rangle') \sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})} \right\rangle'\right)^2\right] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

to obtain the lemma. Compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big(\Big\langle (u_1 - \langle u_1 \rangle') \sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})} \Big\rangle'\Big)^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left\langle (u_1^{(1)} - \langle u_1^{(1)} \rangle')(u_1^{(2)} - \langle u_1^{(2)} \rangle') \sum_{u_1',v_1',u_2',v_2' \in S} P_0(u_1',v_1') P_0(u_2',v_2') \exp(y(u_1',v_1',\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)}) + y(u_2',v_2',\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)})) \right\rangle' \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left\langle \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i^{(1)} - \langle u_i^{(1)} \rangle')(u_i^{(2)} - \langle u_i^{(2)} \rangle') \sum_{u_1',v_1',u_2',v_2'} P_0(u_1',v_1') P_0(u_2',v_2') \exp(y(u_1',v_1',\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)}) + y(u_2',v_2',\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)})) \right\rangle' \\
&\leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left\langle \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i^{(1)} - \langle u_i^{(1)} \rangle')(u_i^{(2)} - \langle u_i^{(2)} \rangle')\right)^2 \right\rangle'\right)^{1/2} \\
&\left(\mathbb{E}\left\langle \sum_{u_1',v_1',u_2',v_2' \in S} P_0(u_1',v_1') P_0(u_2',v_2') \exp(2y(u_1',v_1',\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)}) + 2y(u_2',v_2',\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)})) \right\rangle'\right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality. The bounded support assumption on P_0 implies that, there exists a constant C_2 such that, for all $u_1', v_1', u_2', v_2' \in S$ and $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}^{(2)}, \mathbf{v}^{(2)} \in S^n$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}'\left[\exp\left(2y(u_1',u_2',\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)}) + 2y(u_2',v_2',\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)})\right)\right] \leq C_2$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\Big(\Big\langle (u_1 - \langle u_1 \rangle') \sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})} \Big\rangle'\Big)^2 \leq C_2^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\left\langle \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i^{(1)} - \langle u_i^{(1)} \rangle')(u_i^{(2)} - \langle u_i^{(2)} \rangle')\right)^2 \right\rangle'\right)^{1/2}$$

And the right hand side goes to 0 as $n \to \infty$ by Proposition 15. This concludes the proof. □

Corollary 19

$$\mathbb{E}_a\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big\langle \frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} u_i^{(1)} u_i^{(2)} \Big\rangle_{n+1} - \mathbb{E}[Q_u']\Big| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \tag{44}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_a\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big\langle \frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} v_i^{(1)} v_i^{(2)} \Big\rangle_{n+1} - \mathbb{E}[Q_v']\Big| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \tag{45}$$

Proof. We only need to prove (44), (45) is then obtained by symmetry. By the preceding lemma $\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}|\langle u_1 \rangle_{n+1}^2 - \langle u_1 \rangle'^2| \to 0$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}_a\Big|\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \langle u_i \rangle_{n+1}^2\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \langle u_i \rangle'^2\right]\Big| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0.$$

The variables u_i are bounded, so $\left|\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\langle u_i \rangle_{n+1}^2 - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \langle u_i \rangle_{n+1}^2\right| = O(n^{-1})$, hence the result. □

Let Z_1, Z_2 be two independent standard Gaussian random variables, independent of all other random variables. Define

$$F_\phi : (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') \phi(u',v',U',V') \exp(\sqrt{\gamma_1} Z_1 u' + \gamma_1 u' U' - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_1 u'^2 + \sqrt{\gamma_2} Z_2 v' + \gamma_2 v' V' - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_2 v'^2)}{\sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') \exp(\sqrt{\gamma_1} Z_1 u' + \gamma_1 u' U' - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_1 u'^2 + \sqrt{\gamma_2} Z_2 v' + \gamma_2 v' V' - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_2 v'^2)} \right]$$

Proposition 20

$$\mathbb{E}_a \left| \mathbb{E}\langle \phi(u_1, v_1, U_1, V_1) \rangle_{n+1} - F_\phi \left(\lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_{n+1} + \lambda q_u, \lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_{n+1} + \lambda q_v \right) \right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Proof. Define for $u', v' \in S$

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(u',v') = &\sqrt{\lambda(\frac{n}{n+1} Q'_v + q_u)} Z_1 u' + \lambda(\frac{n}{n+1} Q'_v + q_u) u' U' - \frac{\lambda}{2}(\frac{n}{n+1} Q'_v + q_u) u'^2 \\ &+ \sqrt{\lambda(\frac{n}{n+1} Q'_u + q_v)} Z_2 v' + \lambda(\frac{n}{n+1} Q'_u + q_v) v' V' - \frac{\lambda}{2}(\frac{n}{n+1} Q'_u + q_v) v'^2 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $(U', V', (h_0(u',v'))_{u',v' \in S}) = (U', V', (h_1(u',v'))_{u',v' \in S})$ in law. Indeed, conditionally to (U', V') and $(\langle u_i \rangle', \langle v_i \rangle')_{1 \le i \le n}$, $(h_0(u',v'))_{u',v' \in S}$ and $(h_1(u',v'))_{u',v' \in S}$ are two Gaussian processes with the same covariance structure. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') \phi(u',v',U',V') \exp(h_0(u',v'))}{\sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') \exp(h_0(u',v'))} \right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') \phi(u',v',U',V') \exp(h_1(u',v'))}{\sum_{u',v' \in S} P_0(u',v') \exp(h_1(u',v'))} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[F_\phi \left(\lambda \frac{n}{n+1} Q'_v + \lambda q_u, \lambda \frac{n}{n+1} Q'_u + \lambda q_v \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using Lemma 17 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_a \left| \mathbb{E}\langle \phi(u_1, v_1, U_1, V_1) \rangle_{n+1} - \mathbb{E}\left[F_\phi \left(\lambda \frac{n}{n+1} Q'_v + \lambda q_u, \lambda \frac{n}{n+1} Q'_u + \lambda q_v \right) \right] \right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0.$$

The function F_ϕ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and therefore Lipschitz on the compact set $C = [\lambda q_u - K_0^2, \lambda q_u + K_0^2] \times [\lambda q_v - K_0^2, \lambda q_v + K_0^2]$. We note L_0 its Lipschitz constant. $(\lambda \frac{n}{n+1} Q'_v + \lambda q_u, \lambda \frac{n}{n+1} Q'_u + \lambda q_v)$ belongs to C with probability 1, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E}\left[F_\phi \left(\lambda \frac{n}{n+1} Q'_v + \lambda q_u, \lambda \frac{n}{n+1} Q'_u + \lambda q_v \right) \right] - F_\phi \left(\lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_{n+1} + \lambda q_u, \lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_{n+1} + \lambda q_v \right) \right| \\ &\le L_0 \lambda \mathbb{E}\left(\left(\frac{n}{n+1} Q'_u - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_{n+1} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{n}{n+1} Q'_v - \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_{n+1} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

The expectation of the right hand side with respect to a_u and a_v goes to zero as $n \to \infty$ because the overlaps under $\langle \cdot \rangle'$ concentrate around their expectations, and because of Corollary 19. This concludes the proof. □

We remark that the function F_{P_U} defined as in (9) is in fact the function F_ϕ obtained for the choice $\phi(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) = u_1 u_2$. Similarly, F_{P_V} (defined as in (9)) is the function F_ϕ obtained for $\phi(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) = v_1 v_2$. Proposition 20 implies then that the overlaps satisfy asymptotically two fixed point equations.

Corollary 21

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_a \left| \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_n - F_{P_U}(\lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_n + \lambda q_u) \right| &\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \\ \mathbb{E}_a \left| \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_n - F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_n + \lambda q_v) \right| &\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \end{aligned}$$

5.2 The lower bound: interpolation method

The lower bound is proved using Guerra's interpolation technique [15], originally developed for the SK model. In the context of bipartite spin glasses, this interpolation scheme has been used in [6] under a "replica symmetric" assumption.

Proposition 22

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} F_n \geq \sup_{(q_1,q_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2)$$

Proof. Let $(q_1, q_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$. Define, for $t \in [0,1]$, the Hamiltonians

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{n,t}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) &= \sum_{1\leq i,j\leq n} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda t}{n}} u_i v_j Z_{i,j} + \frac{\lambda t}{n} u_i U_i v_j V_j - \frac{\lambda t}{2n} u_i^2 v_j^2 \\
H_{n,t}^{(s)}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\lambda(1-t)q_1} Z_i^{(u)} u_i + \lambda(1-t)q_1 u_i U_i - \frac{\lambda(1-t)q_1}{2} u_i^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\lambda(1-t)q_2} Z_i^{(v)} v_i + \lambda(1-t)q_2 v_i V_i - \frac{\lambda(1-t)q_2}{2} v_i^2
\end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in S^n$, and $H_{n,t}^{(\mathrm{tot})} = H_{n,t} + H_{n,t}^{(s)} + H_n^{(\mathrm{pert})}$. Let $\langle\cdot\rangle_t$ denotes the Gibbs measure corresponding to the Hamiltonian $\log P_0 + H_{n,t}^{(\mathrm{tot})}$. Define

$$\phi : t \in [0,1] \mapsto \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\left[\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \exp(H_{n,t}^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right)\right]$$

Let $t \in (0,1)$ be fixed. Gaussian integration by parts and Nishimori identity lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi'(t) &= \mathbb{E}_a\left[\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)})(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}) - q_1(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}) - q_2(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)})\Big\rangle_t\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_a\left[\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbb{E}\Big\langle (\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} - q_2)(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} - q_1)\Big\rangle_t\right] - \frac{\lambda}{2}q_1q_2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_a\left[\frac{\lambda}{2}(\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_t - q_2)(\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t - q_1)\right] - \frac{\lambda}{2}q_1q_2 + o_n(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where $o_n(1)$ denotes a quantity that goes to 0 as $n \to \infty$, because of the concentration of the overlaps (Proposition 15). We will show that the first term of the right-hand side of (46) is asymptotically non-negative. This will follow from the fact that the overlaps $\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_t$ and $\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t$ verify the fixed points equations from Corollary 21. We have $q_2 = F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1)$. By Corollary 21

$$\mathbb{E}_a\Big|\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_t - F_{P_U}\left(t\lambda\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t + (1-t)\lambda q_1\right)\Big| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_a\left[(\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_t - q_2)(\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t - q_1)\right] \\
&\qquad = \mathbb{E}_a\left[\left(F_{P_U}\left(\lambda t\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t + (1-t)\lambda q_1\right) - F_{P_U}(\lambda q_1)\right)\left(\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t - q_1\right)\right] + o_n(1) \\
&\qquad \geq o_n(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Because F_{P_U} is non-decreasing (Lemma 39). Consequently, by equation (46)

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \phi'(t) \geq -\frac{\lambda}{2}q_1q_2$$

Using Fatou's lemma

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\big(\phi(1) - \phi(0)\big) = \liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_0^1 \phi'(t)dt \geq \int_0^1 \liminf_{n\to\infty}\phi'(t)dt \geq -\frac{\lambda}{2}q_1q_2 \tag{47}$$

We have $\phi(1) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})e^{H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right)$. Lemma 9 gives us then that $|\phi(1) - F_n| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$, thus $\liminf_{n\to\infty}\phi(1) = \liminf_{n\to\infty} F_n$. For the same reasons than in the proof of Lemma 9, the perturbation term inside $\phi(0)$ will be, in the limit, negligible:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\phi(0)\\
&= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(\sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\lambda q_1}Z_i^{(u)}u_i + \lambda q_1 u_i U_i - \frac{\lambda q_1}{2}u_i^2 + \sqrt{\lambda q_2}Z_i^{(v)}v_i + \lambda q_2 v_i V_i - \frac{\lambda q_2}{2}v_i^2)\right)\\
&= \mathbb{E}\log\left(\sum_{u,v\in S} P_0(u,v)\exp(\sqrt{\lambda q_1}Z_1 u + \lambda q_1 uU - \frac{\lambda q_1}{2}u^2 + \sqrt{\lambda q_2}Z_2 v + \lambda q_2 vV - \frac{\lambda q_2}{2}v^2)\right)\\
&= \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2) + \frac{\lambda}{2}q_1 q_2
\end{aligned}$$

and we conclude using equation (47). □

5.3 Aizenman - Sims - Starr scheme

We prove in this section an upper bound on the limit of the free energy. We consider the special case $q_u = q_v = 0$ (so $H_n^{(s)} = 0$).

Proposition 23

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} F_n \le \limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_a\mathcal{F}\left(\lambda, \mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_n, \mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_n\right) \tag{48}$$

By definition of y (equation (36)), we have $H_{n+1}^{(\mathrm{tot})} = y + H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})\prime}$. One can also express $H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}$ in term of $H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})\prime}$. Let $(\tilde{Z}_{i,j})_{i,j} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and $(\tilde{z}_i^{(u)})_{1\le i\le n}, (\tilde{z}_i^{(v)})_{1\le i\le n} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ independent standard Gaussian random variables, independent of everything else. Define

$$w(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{1\le i,j\le n}\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{n(n+1)}}\tilde{Z}_{i,j}u_i v_j + \frac{\lambda}{n(n+1)}u_i U_i v_j V_j - \frac{\lambda}{2n(n+1)}u_i^2 v_j^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
w^{(\mathrm{pert})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = &\sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{s_n - s_{n+1}}a_u\tilde{z}_i^{(u)}u_i + (s_n - s_{n+1})a_u^2 u_i U_i - \frac{(s_n - s_{n+1})a_u^2}{2}u_i^2\\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{s_n - s_{n+1}}a_v\tilde{z}_i^{(v)}v_i + (s_n - s_{n+1})a_v^2 v_i V_i - \frac{(s_n - s_{n+1})a_v^2}{2}v_i^2
\end{aligned}$$

Then $H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = w(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) + w^{(\mathrm{pert})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) + H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})\prime}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})$ in law. Define the perturbed free energy

$$F_n^{(\mathrm{pert})} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right)\right]$$

and $A_n^{(\mathrm{pert})} = (n+1)F_{n+1}^{(\mathrm{pert})} - nF_n^{(\mathrm{pert})}$ so that, with the convention $F_0^{(\mathrm{pert})} = 0$, $F_n^{(\mathrm{pert})} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}A_k^{(\mathrm{pert})}$. Lemma 9 guarantees that $\mathbb{E}_a|F_n - F_n^{(\mathrm{pert})}| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$. We thus obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} F_n = \limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_a F_n^{(\mathrm{pert})} \le \limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_a A_n^{(\mathrm{pert})}.$$

It remains therefore to compute the limit of $A_n^{(\mathrm{pert})}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
A_n^{(\mathrm{pert})} &= (n+1)F_{n+1}^{(\mathrm{pert})} - nF_n^{(\mathrm{pert})} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(H_{n+1}^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right)\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\left(\sum_{u',v'\in S} P_0(u',v')e^{y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right)\exp(H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})\prime}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp\left(w(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) + w^{(\mathrm{pert})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\right)\exp(H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})\prime}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\log\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S} P_0(u',v')\exp(y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle' - \mathbb{E}\log\left\langle\exp(w(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) + w^{(\mathrm{pert})}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle' \\
&= \mathbb{E}\log\left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S} P_0(u',v')\exp(y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle' - \mathbb{E}\log\langle\exp(w(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\rangle'
\end{aligned}$$

because the contribution of $w^{(\mathrm{pert})}$ is negligible, for the same reasons than in the proof of Lemma 9. Proposition 23 follows then from the following lemma.

Lemma 24

$$\mathbb{E}_a\left|A_n^{(pert)} - \mathcal{F}\left(\lambda, \mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_n, \mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_n\right)\right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Proof. We define

$$\begin{aligned}
U_1 &= \left\langle\sum_{u',v'\in S} P_0(u',v')\exp(y(u',v',\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle' \\
U_2 &= \left\langle\exp(w(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}))\right\rangle'
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$V_1 = \sum_{u',v'\in S} P_0(u',v')\exp(h_0(u',v'))$$

Applying Lemma 16 with $\phi = 1$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}(U_1 - V_1)^2 \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Lemma 25

$$\mathbb{E}_a|\mathbb{E}\log(U_1) - \mathbb{E}\log(V_1)| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Proof. One have $|\log U_1 - \log V_1| \le \max(U_1^{-1}, V_1^{-1})|U_1 - V_1|$. So that

$$\mathbb{E}|\log U_1 - \log V_1| \le \left(\mathbb{E}[U_1^{-2} + V_1^{-2}]\mathbb{E}\left[(U_1 - V_1)^2\right]\right)^{1/2}$$

Because of the bounded support assumption on P_0, $\mathbb{E}[U_1^{-2} + V_1^{-2}]$ is bounded by a constant C_1. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}_a|\mathbb{E}\log(U_1) - \mathbb{E}\log(V_1)| \le \left(C_1\mathbb{E}_a\mathbb{E}\left[(U_1 - V_1)^2\right]\right)^{1/2} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

□

Let Z_1, Z_2 be independent standard Gaussian random variables, independent of everything else. Then the processes $(h_0(u',v'))_{u',v'\in S}$ and

$$\left(u'\sqrt{\frac{\lambda n Q'_v}{n+1}}Z_1 + u'U'\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_v - u'^2\frac{n\lambda}{2(n+1)}Q'_v + v'\sqrt{\frac{\lambda n Q'_u}{n+1}}Z_2 + v'V'\frac{n\lambda}{n+1}Q'_u - v'^2\frac{n\lambda}{2(n+1)}Q'_u\right)_{u',v'\in S}$$

have the same law. Indeed, conditionally on (U', V') and $(\langle u_i \rangle', \langle v_i \rangle')_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ both are Gaussian processes with the same covariance structure. Consequently

$$\mathbb{E} \log(V_1) = \mathbb{E}\left[\psi_{P_U}\left(\frac{\lambda n Q_v'}{n+1}\right) + \psi_{P_V}\left(\frac{\lambda n Q_u'}{n+1}\right)\right].$$

ψ_{P_U} and ψ_{P_V} are $\mathcal{C}^1$ on the compact set $[-\lambda K_0^2, \lambda K_0^2]$ and are thus Lipschitz on this set. Using the overlap concentration under the Gibbs measure $\langle \cdot \rangle'$ and Corollary 19, one obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_a \left| \mathbb{E} \log(V_1) - \left(\psi_{P_U}\left(\lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_n\right) + \psi_{P_V}\left(\lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_n\right)\right) \right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

and consequently

$$\mathbb{E}_a \left| \mathbb{E} \log(U_1) - \left(\psi_{P_U}\left(\lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_n\right) + \psi_{P_V}\left(\lambda \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_n\right)\right) \right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Using the same kind of arguments, one show that

$$\mathbb{E}_a \left| \mathbb{E} \log(U_2) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_n \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_n \right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_a \left| A_n^{(\text{pert})} - \mathcal{F}\left(\lambda, \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_n, \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_n\right) \right| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

□

5.4 The final part

We conclude the proof of Theorem 4 in this section, using the results of the previous sections. In this Section, we still consider $q_u = q_v = 0$ (so $H_n^{(s)} = 0$).

Let $(n_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be an extraction along which the superior limit of $(F_n)_n$ is achieved. For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_n$ and $\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_n$ are thus (a_u, a_v)-measurable random variables. Without loss of generalities we can assume that $(\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_{n_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_{n_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ are converging in law along this subsequence (if not, Prokhorov's theorem allows us to find another extraction of (n_k) along with these quantities converges). Denote by Q_u^∞ and Q_v^∞ their respective limits. The functions $\mathcal{F}$, F_{P_U}, F_{P_V} are continuous and $\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle_n$ and $\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} \rangle_n$ are bounded, thus by weak convergence Proposition 23 and Corollary 21 (applied with $q_u = q_v = 0$) give

$$\mathbb{E}_a \left| Q_u^\infty - F_{P_U}(\lambda Q_v^\infty) \right| = 0 \tag{49}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_a \left| Q_v^\infty - F_{P_V}(\lambda Q_u^\infty) \right| = 0 \tag{50}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} F_n \leq \mathbb{E}_a \mathcal{F}\left(\lambda, Q_u^\infty, Q_v^\infty\right) \tag{51}$$

Equations (49) and (50) give that $(Q_u^\infty, Q_v^\infty) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$ with probability 1. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{F}\left(\lambda, Q_u^\infty, Q_v^\infty\right) \leq \sup_{(q_1,q_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2)$$

almost surely. We conclude, using equation (51) that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} F_n \leq \sup_{(q_1,q_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, q_1, q_2)$, which proves (combined with Proposition 22) the first expression for the limit of F_n. Theorem 4 follows then from Proposition 42.

6 Extension to multidimensional input distributions

We extend in this section the main results of Section 2 to any multidimensional input distributions with finite second moment.

Let P_U and P_V be two probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}^k$ with finite second moment and such that $\mathrm{Cov}_{P_U}(\mathbf{U}) \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathrm{Cov}_{P_V}(\mathbf{V}) \succ \mathbf{0}$. Let $P_0 = P_U \otimes P_V$.

Consider now i.i.d. random variables $(\mathbf{U}_i)_{1\le i\le n} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P_U$ and $(\mathbf{V}_i)_{1\le i\le m} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P_V$. We will consider the regime where $n, m \to \infty$ and $m/n \to \alpha > 0$. We observe

$$Y_{i,j} = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}\mathbf{U}_i^\intercal \mathbf{V}_j + Z_{i,j} \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le n,\ 1 \le j \le m \tag{52}$$

where $Z_{i,j}$ are i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Similarly to Section 2 we define the minimal mean square error for the estimation of the matrix $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\intercal$ given the observation of the matrix $\mathbf{Y}$:

$$\text{MMSE}_n(\lambda) = \min_{\hat\theta}\left\{\frac{1}{nm}\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le n\\ 1\le j\le m}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbf{U}_i^\intercal\mathbf{V}_j - \hat\theta_{i,j}(\mathbf{Y})\right)^2\right]\right\} = \frac{1}{nm}\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le n\\ 1\le j\le m}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbf{U}_i^\intercal\mathbf{V}_j - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{U}_i^\intercal\mathbf{V}_j|\mathbf{Y}\right]\right)^2\right],$$

where the minimum is taken over all estimators $\hat\theta$ (i.e. measurable functions of the observations $\mathbf{Y}$ that could also depend on auxiliary randomness). Define the Hamiltonian

$$H_n(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{\substack{1\le i\le n\\ 1\le j\le m}} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{v}_j Z_{i,j} + \frac{\lambda}{n}\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{v}_j\mathbf{U}_i^\intercal\mathbf{V}_j - \frac{\lambda}{2n}(\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{v}_j)^2, \quad \text{for } (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \in (\mathbb{R}^k)^n \times (\mathbb{R}^k)^n. \tag{53}$$

The free energy is then

$$F_n = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log\left(\int dP_0^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})e^{H_n(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}\right)$$

6.1 The Replica-Symmetric formula and its consequences

Let F_{P_U} and F_{P_V} be the overlap function defined in Section 7.1. We define the set of fixed point analogously to the unidimensional case.

Definition 26

We define the set $\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha)$ *as*

$$\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha) = \left\{(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2) \in (S_k^+)^2 \;\middle|\; \mathbf{q}_2 = F_{P_U}(\lambda\alpha\mathbf{q}_1) \text{ and } \mathbf{q}_1 = F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2)\right\} \tag{54}$$

First notice that $\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha)$ is not empty. When $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{U} = \mathbb{E}\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{0}$ this is obvious: we have $(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$, so $\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. In the general case, notice that (by Lemma 39 (v)) F_{P_U} and F_{P_V} take their values in

$$C = \left\{\mathbf{M} \in S_k^+ \mid \mathbf{M} \preceq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\intercal] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\intercal]\right\}$$

which is convex and compact. Notice that the function $F : (\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2) \mapsto (F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2), F_{P_U}(\lambda\alpha\mathbf{q}_1))$ is continuous from C to C. Brouwer's theorem gives the existence of a fixed point of F: $\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha) \neq \emptyset$.

Similarly to the unidimensional case we will express the limit of F_n using the functions ψ_{P_U} and ψ_{P_V} defined in Section 7.1. Let

$$\begin{array}{rccl}\mathcal{F}: & \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \times (S_k^+)^2 & \to & \mathbb{R}\\ & (\lambda,\alpha,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2) & \mapsto & \psi_{P_U}(\lambda\alpha\mathbf{q}_1) + \alpha\psi_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2) - \frac{1}{2}\lambda\alpha\text{Tr}\left[\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_2\right]\end{array}$$

We have then the analogue of Theorem 4.

Theorem 27 (*Replica-Symmetric formula*)

$$F_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \sup_{(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda,\alpha,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2) = \sup_{\mathbf{q}_1\in S_k^+}\inf_{\mathbf{q}_2\in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda,\alpha,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)$$

Moreover, these extrema are achieved over the same couples $(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda,\alpha)$.

Theorem 27 will be proved in Section 6.2. The Replica-Symmetric formula allows to compute the limit of the mutual information for the inference channel (52).

Corollary 28 (*Limit of the mutual information*)

$$\frac{1}{n}I((\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V});\mathbf{Y}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \frac{\lambda\alpha}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\intercal]\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\intercal]\big] - \sup_{(\mathbf{q_1},\mathbf{q_2})\in\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda,\alpha,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)$$

The proof is analogous to the one of Corollary 5 and is left to the reader.

In the multidimensional case the overlaps becomes $k\times k$ matrices. For $\mathbf{x}^{(1)},\mathbf{x}^{(2)}\in(\mathbb{R}^k)^n$ we write

$$\mathbf{x}^{(1)}.\mathbf{x}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{x}_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(2)})^\intercal \in M_{k,k}(\mathbb{R})$$

$\|\cdot\|$ will now denote the norm over $M_{k,k}(\mathbb{R})$ defined as $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \sqrt{\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^\intercal\mathbf{A})}$.

Proposition 29 (*Limit of the* MMSE)

Define the function

$$\Phi : \lambda > 0 \mapsto \lim_{n\to\infty} F_n = \sup_{(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda,\alpha,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2). \tag{55}$$

Φ is convex. Let $D\subset(0,+\infty)$ be the set of points where Φ is differentiable. By convexity, D is equal to $(0,+\infty)$ minus a countable set. For all $\lambda\in D$, there exist $Q(\lambda,\alpha)\in\mathbb{R}_+$ such that, for all $(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda,\alpha)$ achieving the supremum in (55), $\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_2] = Q(\lambda,\alpha)$. Moreover

$$\mathrm{MMSE}_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \mathrm{Tr}\big[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\intercal]\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\intercal]\big] - Q(\lambda,\alpha) \tag{56}$$

The proof of Proposition 29 is a simple extension of the proof of Proposition 6 and is therefore left to the reader.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 27

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 27. It extends the arguments presented in Section 5 to the multidimensional case. The ingredients of the proof are the same: we will therefore sometimes refer to the unidimensional proof. For simplicity we only consider the case $\alpha = 1$, the general case follows from the same arguments.

6.2.1 Reduction to finite distribution

We will show in this section that it suffices to prove Theorem 27 for distributions with finite supports.

Suppose the Theorem 27 holds for distributions $P_0 = P_U\otimes P_V$ over $\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{R}^k$ with finite support. Let $P_0 = P_U\otimes P_V$ be a probability distribution with finite second moments. In order to show that Theorem 27 holds for P_0, we are going to approach P_0 with distributions with finite supports.

Let $0<\epsilon\leq 1$. Let $K_0>0$ such that for any marginal μ of P_0, $\mu([-K_0,K_0])>1-\epsilon^2$. Let $m\in\mathbb{N}^*$ such that $\frac{K_0}{m}\leq\epsilon$. For $x\in\mathbb{R}$ we will use the notation

$$\bar{x} = \begin{cases} \frac{K_0}{m}\left\lfloor\frac{xm}{K_0}\right\rfloor & \text{if } x\in[-K_0,K_0] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Consequently if $x\in[-K_0,K_0]$, $\bar{x}\leq x<\bar{x}+\frac{K_0}{m}\leq\bar{x}+\epsilon$. For $\mathbf{x}\in[-K_0,K_0]^k$ we also define $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = (\bar{x}_1,\dots,\bar{x}_k)\in\bar{S}$ where $\bar{S} = \{i\frac{K_0}{m}\mid i=-m,\dots,m\}^k$. Finally, we define $\bar{P}_0$ the image distribution of P_0 through the application $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\mapsto(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}})$. Let $n\geq 1$. We will note $\bar{F}_n$ the free energy corresponding to the distribution $\bar{P}_0$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ the function $\mathcal{F}$ corresponding to the distribution $\bar{P}_0$. $\bar{P}_0$ has a finite support, we have then by assumptions

$$\bar{F}_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \sup_{\mathbf{q_1}\in S_k^+}\inf_{\mathbf{q_2}\in S_k^+}\bar{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda,\mathbf{q_1},\mathbf{q_2}) \tag{57}$$

Lemma 30

There exists a constant $C > 0$, that depends only on λ and P_0 such that, for all $n \geq 1$

$$|F_n - \bar{F}_n| \leq C\epsilon$$

Proof. We define, for $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in (\mathbb{R}^k)^n \times (\mathbb{R}^k)^n$

$$\begin{aligned} H_{n,t}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = &\sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda t}{n}} Z_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_i^\intercal \mathbf{v}_j + \frac{\lambda t}{n} \mathbf{u}_i^\intercal \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{U}_i^\intercal \mathbf{V}_j - \frac{\lambda t}{2n} (\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal \mathbf{v}_j)^2 \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda(1-t)}{n}} Z'_{i,j} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_i^\intercal \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j + \frac{\lambda(1-t)}{n} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_i^\intercal \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i^\intercal \bar{\mathbf{V}}_j - \frac{\lambda(1-t)}{2n} (\bar{\mathbf{u}}_i^\intercal \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\phi(t) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \log \left(\int dP_0^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \exp\left(H_{n,t}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}) \right) \right)$$

Remark that $\phi(0) = \bar{F}_n$ and $\phi(1) = F_n$. Let $\langle \cdot \rangle_t$ be the Gibbs measure on $S^n \times S^n$ associated with the Hamiltonian $H_{n,t}$. For $0 < t < 1$ we have, by Gaussian integration by parts and the Nishimori property:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(t) &= \frac{\lambda}{2n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \mathbb{E} \left\langle \left(\mathbf{u}_i^{(1)\intercal} \mathbf{v}_j^{(1)} \right) \left(\mathbf{u}_i^{(2)\intercal} \mathbf{v}_j^{(2)} \right) - \left(\bar{\mathbf{u}}_i^{(1)} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j^{(1)} \right) \left(\bar{\mathbf{u}}_i^{(2)\intercal} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j^{(2)} \right) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\langle \left(\mathbf{u}_1^{(1)\intercal} \mathbf{v}_1^{(1)} \right) \left(\mathbf{u}_1^{(2)\intercal} \mathbf{v}_1^{(2)} \right) - \left(\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1^{(1)} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_1^{(1)} \right) \left(\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1^{(2)\intercal} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_1^{(2)} \right) \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel we will omit the lower indices, and write for instance $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}$ instead of $\mathbf{u}_1^{(1)}$. $\phi'(t)$ can thus be bounded by a sum 4 terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda}{2} \left| \mathbb{E} \left\langle \left((\mathbf{u}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)})^\intercal . \mathbf{v}^{(1)} \right) \left(\mathbf{u}^{(2)\intercal} \mathbf{v}^{(2)} \right) \right\rangle \right| &\leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left\langle \left\| (\mathbf{u}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)})^\intercal \mathbf{v}^{(1)} \right\|^2 \right\rangle \mathbb{E} \left\langle \left\| \mathbf{u}^{(2)\intercal} \mathbf{v}^{(2)} \right\|^2 \right\rangle \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| (\mathbf{U} - \bar{\mathbf{U}})^\intercal \mathbf{V} \right\|^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{U}^\intercal \mathbf{V} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{U}\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{V}\|^2 \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{U} - \bar{\mathbf{U}} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{U} - \bar{\mathbf{U}} \right\|^2 \leq (k(1-\epsilon^2)\epsilon^2 + \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{U}\|^2) = O(\epsilon^2)$. Thus $\phi'(t) = O(\epsilon)$ and $|\phi(1) - \phi(0)| = O(\epsilon)$, which concludes the proof. □

Lemma 31

$$\left| \sup_{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+} \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) - \sup_{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+} \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \bar{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \right| \leq C'\epsilon$$

Proof. First notice that both sup-inf are achieved over a common compact set. Indeed, they are achieved on the sets $\Gamma(\lambda)$ corresponding to P_0 and $\bar{P}_0$ that are included in common compact set $K \times K$. Using the same kind of arguments that in the proof of Lemma 30, we obtain that there exists a constant C' that depends only on λ and P_0 such that $\forall (\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q_2}) \in K^2$, $|\mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) - \bar{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)| \leq C'\epsilon$. This proves the lemma. □

Combining equation 57 and Lemmas 30 and 31, we obtain that there exists $n_0 \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$\left| F_n - \sup_{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+} \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \right| \leq (C + C' + 1)\epsilon$$

where C and C' are two constants independent of n_0 and ϵ. This proves Theorem 27. It remains therefore to prove Theorem 27 for distribution $P_0 = P_U \otimes P_V$ with finite support $S \times S$. In the following, we suppose such a distribution to be fixed.

6.2.2 Adding a small perturbation

The major difference with the proof presented in Section 5 is the kind of perturbation we will add to our observation system, in order to obtain concentration results for the overlaps. Instead of adding low-signal Gaussian scalar channels (see (24)), we will rather reveal each variable $(\mathbf{U}_i, \mathbf{V}_i)$ with small probability. Lemma 3.1 from [31] shows that this kind of perturbation forces the correlations to decay. This approach has already been used in [23] and [10] to obtain overlaps concentration.

Let $\epsilon \in [0,1]$, and suppose we have access to the additional information, for $1 \leq i \leq n$

$$\mathbf{Y}'_i = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{U}_i, \mathbf{V}_i) & \text{if } L_i = 1 \\ (*,*) & \text{if } L_i = 0 \end{cases} \tag{58}$$

where $L_i \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Ber}(\epsilon)$ and $*$ is a value that does not belong to S. The posterior distribution of $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ given $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}')$ is now

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V}) = (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}') = \frac{1}{Z_{n,\epsilon}} \left(\prod_{i|\mathbf{Y}'_i \neq (*,*)} 1((\mathbf{u}_i,\mathbf{v}_i) = \mathbf{Y}'_i) \right) \left(\prod_{i|\mathbf{Y}'_i=(*,*)} P_0(\mathbf{u}_i,\mathbf{v}_i) \right) e^{H_n(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})} \tag{59}$$

where $Z_{n,\epsilon}$ is the appropriate normalization constant. For $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \in S^n \times S^n$ we will use the following (very convenient) notations

$$\bar{\mathbf{u}} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_n) = (L_1\mathbf{U}_1 + (1-L_1)\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, L_n\mathbf{U}_n + (1-L_n)\mathbf{u}_n) \tag{60}$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{v}} = (\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n) = (L_1\mathbf{V}_1 + (1-L_1)\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, L_n\mathbf{V}_n + (1-L_n)\mathbf{v}_n) \tag{61}$$

$\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$ are thus obtained by replacing the coordinates of $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ that are revealed by $\mathbf{Y}'$ by their revealed values. The notations $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$ will allow us to obtain a very convenient expression for the free energy of the perturbed model which is defined as

$$F_{n,\epsilon} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log Z_{n,\epsilon} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\Big[\log \sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \exp(H_n(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}}))\Big]$$

Proposition 32

For all $n \geq 1$ and all $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in [0,1]$, we have

$$|F_{n,\epsilon} - F_{n,\epsilon'}| \leq k^2 \lambda K_0^4 |\epsilon - \epsilon'|.$$

Proof. We are going to bound the derivative of $f : \epsilon \mapsto F_{n,\epsilon}$. To do so, we are going to consider a slightly more general model where the probability of revealing X_i depends on i: for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $L_i \sim \text{Ber}(\epsilon_i)$. We will show that $|\frac{\partial F_{n,\epsilon}}{\partial \epsilon_i}| \leq k^2\lambda K_0^4$ for $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. By symmetry between the variables, it suffices to control $\frac{\partial F_{n,\epsilon}}{\partial \epsilon_1}$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{n,\epsilon} &= \epsilon_1 \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\log \sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(H_n(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}}))\Big| L_1 = 1\right] + (1-\epsilon_1)\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\log \sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(H_n(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}}))\Big| L_1 = 0\right] \\ &= \epsilon_1 \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\log \sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp\Big(H_n\big((\mathbf{U}_1,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_n),(\mathbf{V}_1,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n)\big)\Big)\right] \\ &\quad + (1-\epsilon_1)\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\log \sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp\Big(H_n\big((\mathbf{u}_1,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_n),(\mathbf{v}_1,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n)\big)\Big)\right] \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_{n,\epsilon}}{\partial \epsilon_1} &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\log\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp\Big(H_n\big((\mathbf{U}_1,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_n),(\mathbf{V}_1,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n)\big)\Big)\right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\log\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n} P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp\Big(H_n\big((\mathbf{u}_1,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_n),(\mathbf{v}_1,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n)\big)\Big)\right] \end{aligned}$$

Define the Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_n(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{2\le i,j\le n} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}} Z_{i,j} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_i^\intercal \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j + \frac{\lambda}{n} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_i^\intercal \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j \mathbf{U}_i^\intercal \mathbf{V}_j - \frac{\lambda}{2n} (\bar{\mathbf{u}}_i^\intercal \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j)^2$. Let $\langle\cdot\rangle^{(0)}$ denote the Gibbs measure (on $S^{n-1}\times S^{n-1}$) corresponding to the Hamiltonian $\log P_0 + \tilde{H}_n$. We write $D_1 = \big\{(i,1),(1,j) \mid 1 \le i,j \le n\big\}$ and define $h(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{(i,j)\in D_1} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}} Z_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_i^\intercal \mathbf{v}_j + \frac{\lambda}{n} \mathbf{u}_i^\intercal \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{U}_i^\intercal \mathbf{V}_j - \frac{\lambda}{2n} (\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal \mathbf{v}_j)^2$. We can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial F_{n,\epsilon}}{\partial \epsilon_1} &= \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log\Big\langle \exp\Big(h\big((\mathbf{U}_1,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_n),(\mathbf{V}_1,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n)\big)\Big)\Big\rangle^{(0)} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log\Big\langle \sum_{\mathbf{u}_1,\mathbf{v}_1\in S} P_0(\mathbf{u}_1,\mathbf{v}_1)\exp\Big(h\big((\mathbf{u}_1,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_n),(\mathbf{v}_1,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n)\big)\Big)\Big\rangle^{(0)}\end{aligned}$$

where $(\mathbf{u}_i,\mathbf{v}_i)_{2\le i\le n}$ is sampled from $\langle\cdot\rangle^{(0)}$, independently of everything else. Let $\mathbb{E}_1$ denote the expectation with respect to the variables $(Z_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in D_1}$ only. By Jensen's inequality

$$\frac{\partial F_{n,\epsilon}}{\partial \epsilon_1} \le \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log\Big\langle \mathbb{E}_1\exp\Big(h\big((\mathbf{U}_1,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{u}}_n),(\mathbf{V}_1,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_2,\dots,\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n)\big)\Big)\Big\rangle^{(0)} \le \frac{k^2\lambda K_0^4}{n}$$

Analogously one have $\frac{\partial F_{n,\epsilon}}{\partial \epsilon_1} \ge -\frac{k^2\lambda K_0^4}{n}$. Consequently, for all $i\in\{1,\dots,n\}$, $\big|\frac{\partial F_{n,\epsilon}}{\partial \epsilon_i}\big| \le \frac{k^2\lambda K_0^4}{n}$. This implies that $|f'| \le k^2\lambda K_0^4$ and proves the lemma. □

We define now ϵ as a uniform random variable over $[0,1]$, independently of every other random variable. We will note $\mathbb{E}_\epsilon$ the expectation with respect to ϵ. For $n\ge 1$, we define also $\epsilon_n = n^{-1/2}\epsilon \sim \mathcal{U}[0,n^{-1/2}]$. Proposition 32 implies that

$$\big|F_n - \mathbb{E}_\epsilon[F_{n,\epsilon_n}]\big| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0.$$

It remains therefore to compute the limit of the free energy averaged over small perturbations.

6.2.3 Overlap concentration

Let $\langle\cdot\rangle$ denote the expectation with respect to the posterior distribution (59) of $(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V})$ given $(\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}')$. The Nishimori identity (Proposition 1) will thus be valid under $\langle\cdot\rangle$. We recall that $\mathbf{Y}'$ is defined in (58), where $L_i \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathrm{Ber}(\epsilon_n)$ are independent random variables.

The following lemma comes from [31] (lemma 3.1). It shows that the extra information $\mathbf{Y}'$ forces the correlations to decay.

Lemma 33

$$n^{-1/2}\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\left[\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{1\le i,j\le n} I\big((\mathbf{U}_i,\mathbf{V}_i);(\mathbf{U}_j,\mathbf{V}_j) \mid \mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}'\big)\right] \le \frac{2H(P_0)}{n}$$

This implies that the overlap between two replicas, i.e. two independent samples $(\mathbf{u}^{(1)},\mathbf{v}^{(1)})$ and $(\mathbf{u}^{(2)},\mathbf{v}^{(2)})$ from the Gibbs distribution $\langle\cdot\rangle$, concentrates. Let us define

$$\mathbf{Q}_u = \Big\langle \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{u}_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{u}_i^{(2)})^\intercal \Big\rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle \tag{62}$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_v = \Big\langle \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{v}_i^{(2)})^\intercal \Big\rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle \tag{63}$$

$\mathbf{Q}_u$ and $\mathbf{Q}_v$ are two random variables depending only on $(Y_{i,j})_{1\le i,j\le n}$ and $(\mathbf{Y}'_i)_{1\le i\le n}$. Notice that $\mathbf{Q}_u,\mathbf{Q}_v \in S_k^+$.

Proposition 34 (*Overlap concentration*)

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\Big\langle \|\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} - \mathbf{Q}_u\|^2\Big\rangle \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0, \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\Big\langle \|\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} - \mathbf{Q}_v\|^2\Big\rangle \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0.$$

Proof.

$$\big\langle \|\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} - \mathbf{Q}_u\|^2 \big\rangle = \big\langle \|\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\|^2 \big\rangle - \|\langle \mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \rangle\|^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \langle \mathbf{u}_i^{(1)\intercal}\mathbf{u}_i^{(2)}\mathbf{u}_j^{(1)\intercal}\mathbf{u}_j^{(2)}\rangle - \langle \mathbf{u}_i^{(1)\intercal}\rangle\langle \mathbf{u}_i^{(2)}\rangle\langle \mathbf{u}_j^{(1)\intercal}\rangle\langle \mathbf{u}_j^{(2)}\rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \|\langle \mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_j^\intercal\rangle\|^2 - \|\langle \mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\rangle\langle \mathbf{u}_j\rangle\|^2 \le \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \Big| \|\langle \mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_j^\intercal\rangle\| - \|\langle \mathbf{u}_i\rangle\langle \mathbf{u}_j^\intercal\rangle\| \Big| \le \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \|\langle \mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_j^\intercal\rangle - \langle \mathbf{u}_i\rangle\langle \mathbf{u}_j^\intercal\rangle\|$$

$$\le \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \Big\| \sum_{\mathbf{u}_i,\mathbf{u}_j} \mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_j^\intercal \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_i = \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{U}_j = \mathbf{u}_j|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}') - \mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_j^\intercal \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_i = \mathbf{u}_i|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}')\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_j = \mathbf{u}_j|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}') \Big\|$$

$$\le \frac{C'}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \mathrm{D_{TV}}\big(\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_i = .,\mathbf{U}_j = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}'); \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_i = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}') \otimes \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_j = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}')\big)$$

$$\le \frac{C'}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \mathrm{D_{TV}}\big(\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{U}_i,\mathbf{V}_i) = .,(\mathbf{U}_j,\mathbf{V}_j) = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}'); \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{U}_i,\mathbf{V}_i) = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}') \otimes \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{U}_j,\mathbf{V}_j) = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}')\big)$$

$$\le C'' \sqrt{\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} \mathrm{D_{KL}}\big(\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{U}_i,\mathbf{V}_i) = .,(\mathbf{U}_j,\mathbf{V}_j) = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}'); \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{U}_i,\mathbf{V}_i) = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}') \otimes \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{U}_j,\mathbf{V}_j) = .|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}')\big)}$$

for some constants $C, C', C'' > 0$, where we used Pinsker's inequality to compare the total variation distance $\mathrm{D_{TV}}$ with the Kullback-Leibler divergence $\mathrm{D_{KL}}$. So that:

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \|\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)} - \mathbf{Q}_u\|^2 \Big\rangle \le C'' \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\Big[\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1\le i,j\le n} I((\mathbf{U}_i,\mathbf{V}_i);(\mathbf{U}_j,\mathbf{V}_j)|\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Y}')\Big]} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

The second limit is obtained by symmetry. □

As a consequence of the Nishimori identity, the overlap between one replica and the planted solution concentrates around the same value than the overlap between two independent replicas.

Corollary 35

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \|\mathbf{u}.\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{Q}_u\|^2 \Big\rangle \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \|\mathbf{v}.\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{Q}_v\|^2 \Big\rangle \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

6.2.4 Aizenman-Sims-Starr scheme

Using the concentration results of Proposition 34 and Corollary 35, the proofs of Section 5.3 can be extended to the multidimensional case.

Proposition 36

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} F_n \le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{Q}_v, \mathbf{Q}_u) \tag{64}$$

6.2.5 Fixed point equations

Let $\mathbf{q}_u, \mathbf{q}_v \in S_k^+$. Suppose that we have access to the additional observations

$$Y_i^{(u)} = \sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{q}_u^{1/2}\mathbf{U}_i + \mathbf{Z}_i^{(u)}, \qquad \text{for } 1 \le i \le n$$
$$Y_i^{(v)} = \sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{q}_v^{1/2}\mathbf{V}_i + \mathbf{Z}_i^{(v)}, \qquad \text{for } 1 \le i \le n$$

where $(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(u)})_{1\le i\le n}$ and $(\mathbf{Z}_i^{(v)})_{1\le i\le n}$ are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_k)$, independently of everything else. Let $\mathbf{Q_u}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_v$ be defined as in equations (62) and (63), where the Gibbs measure $\langle\cdot\rangle$ denotes the posterior distribution of (U, V) given Y, Y', $Y^{(u)}$ and $Y^{(v)}$. Notice that Proposition 34 and Corollary 35 still hold for this Gibbs distribution (the proofs are the same). The arguments of Section 5.1 can be extended to the multidimensional case to obtain the multidimensional version of Corollary 21:

Proposition 37

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\Big\|\mathbf{Q}_u - F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{Q}_v + \lambda\mathbf{q}_u)\Big\| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$
$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\Big\|\mathbf{Q}_v - F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{Q}_u + \lambda\mathbf{q}_v)\Big\| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

6.2.6 The lower bound: interpolation method

Proposition 38

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} F_n \geq \sup_{(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)$$

Proof. Let $(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)\in\Gamma(\lambda)$. Define, for $t\in[0,1]$, the Hamiltonians

$$H_{n,t}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{1\leq i,j\leq n}\sqrt{\frac{\lambda t}{n}}\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{v}_j\mathbf{Z}_{i,j} + \frac{\lambda t}{n}\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{v}_j\mathbf{U}_i^\intercal\mathbf{V}_j - \frac{\lambda t}{2n}(\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{v}_j)^2$$
$$H_{n,t}^{(s)}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n\sqrt{\lambda(1-t)}\mathbf{Z}_i^{(u)\intercal}\mathbf{q}_1^{1/2}\mathbf{u}_i + \lambda(1-t)\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{U}_i - \frac{\lambda(1-t)\mathbf{q}_1}{2}(\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{u}_i)^2$$
$$+\sum_{i=1}^n\sqrt{\lambda(1-t)}\mathbf{Z}_i^{(v)\intercal}\mathbf{q}_2^{1/2}\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda(1-t)\mathbf{v}_i^\intercal\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{V}_i - \frac{\lambda(1-t)\mathbf{q}_2}{2}(\mathbf{v}_i^\intercal\mathbf{v}_i)^2$$

for $\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n$, and $H_{n,t}^{(\mathrm{tot})} = H_{n,t} + H_{n,t}^{(s)}$. Let $\langle\cdot\rangle_t$ be the Gibbs measure defined as

$$\langle h(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\rangle_t = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n}P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})h(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}})\exp(H_{n,t}^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n}P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(H_{n,t}^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}}))}, \text{ for any function } h \text{ on } (S^n)^2.$$

Define

$$\phi : t\in[0,1]\mapsto \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n}P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(H_{n,t}^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}}))\right)\right].$$

Let $t\in(0,1)$ be fixed. Gaussian integration by parts and Nishimori identity lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\phi'(t) &= \mathbb{E}_\epsilon\left[\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbb{E}\Big\langle\mathrm{Tr}\big[(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)})^\intercal(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}) - \mathbf{q}_1(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}) - \mathbf{q}_2(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)})\big]\Big\rangle_t\right]\\ &= \mathbb{E}_\epsilon\left[\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbb{E}\Big\langle((\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)})^\intercal - \mathbf{q}_2)(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)} - \mathbf{q}_1)\Big\rangle_t\right] - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_2]\\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{Tr}\big[(\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_t - \mathbf{q}_2)(\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t - \mathbf{q}_1)\big]\right] - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_2] + o_n(1)\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where $o_n(1)$ denotes a quantity that goes to 0 as $n\to\infty$, because of the concentration of the overlaps (Proposition 34). By Proposition 37

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\Big\|\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_t - F_{P_U}(\lambda t\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t + \lambda(1-t)\mathbf{q}_1)\Big\| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

We have also $\mathbf{q}_2 = F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\langle\mathbf{u}^{(1)}.\mathbf{u}^{(2)}\rangle_t - \mathbf{q}_2)(\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t - \mathbf{q}_1)\right]\right]\\ &\quad= \mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Big(F_{P_U}(\lambda t\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t + \lambda(1-t)\mathbf{q}_1) - F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1)\Big)\Big(\langle\mathbf{v}^{(1)}.\mathbf{v}^{(2)}\rangle_t - \mathbf{q}_1\Big)\right]\right] + o_n(1)\\ &\quad\geq o_n(1)\end{aligned}$$

because $\frac{1}{2}F_{P_U}$ is the gradient of the convex function ψ_{P_U} (Lemma 39). Consequently, by equation (65)

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\phi'(t) \geq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_2$$

Using Fatou's lemma

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\big(\phi(1)-\phi(0)\big)=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_0^1\phi'(t)dt\geq\int_0^1\liminf_{n\to\infty}\phi'(t)dt\geq-\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_2 \tag{66}$$

We have $\phi(1)=\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_\epsilon\mathbb{E}\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n}P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})e^{H_n^{(\mathrm{tot})}(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{v}})}\right)=\mathbb{E}_\epsilon[F_{n,\epsilon}]$. Hence $\liminf_{n\to\infty}\phi(1)=\liminf_{n\to\infty}F_n$. Analogously to Proposition 32, the effect of the perturbation term inside $\phi(0)$ will be, in the limit, negligible:

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\phi(0)&=\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S^n}P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(\sum_{i=1}^n\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{Z}^{(u)\intercal}\mathbf{q}_1^{1/2}\mathbf{u}_i+\lambda\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{U}_i-\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{u}_i^\intercal\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{u}_i\\&\qquad+\sum_{i=1}^n\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{Z}_i^{(v)}\mathbf{q}_2^{1/2}\mathbf{v}_i+\lambda\mathbf{v}_i^\intercal\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{V}_i-\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{v}_i^\intercal\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{v}_i)\Big)\\&=\mathbb{E}\log\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in S}P_0(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\exp(\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{Z}_1^\intercal\mathbf{q}_1^{1/2}\mathbf{u}+\lambda\mathbf{u}^\intercal\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{U}-\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{u}^\intercal\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{u}+\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{Z}_2\mathbf{q}_2^{1/2}\mathbf{v}+\lambda\mathbf{v}^\intercal\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{V}-\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{v}^\intercal\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{v})\right)\\&=\mathcal{F}(\lambda,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)+\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_2\end{aligned}$$

We conclude using equation (66): $\liminf_{n\to\infty}F_n\geq\mathcal{F}(\lambda,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)$. □

6.2.7 The final part

The remaining of the proof is exactly the same than in the unidimensional case (Section 5.4): the variables $\mathbf{Q}_u$ and $\mathbf{Q}_v$ converge along a subsequence to a point of $\Gamma(\lambda)$, because of Proposition 37. This proves the converse bound of Proposition 38 and thus Theorem 27 (again we use Proposition 42 to obtain the "max-min formula").

7 Appendix: the linear Gaussian channel

In this section we will work with positive semi-definite matrices. We will denote by S_k^+ the set of $k\times k$ positive semi-definite matrices. Recall that S_k^+ is a convex cone. We will also use Loewner (partial) order $\preceq$ on S_k^+. For $\mathbf{A},\mathbf{B}\in S_k^+$,

$$\mathbf{A}\preceq\mathbf{B}\iff\forall\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^k,\ \mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\leq\mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}\iff\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{A}\in S_k^+.$$

We will also use the strict inequality $\prec$: $\mathbf{A}\prec\mathbf{B}\iff\forall\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^k,\ \mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}<\mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}$. Note that when $k=1$, $\preceq$ and $\prec$ correspond to the usual ordering of $\mathbb{R}$.

7.1 Properties of the linear Gaussian channel

Let P_X be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n\geq1$) with finite second moment and $\mathbf{X}\sim P_X$. Let $\mathbf{Z}\sim\mathcal{N}(0,\mathbf{I}_n)$ be independent from $\mathbf{X}$. Let $q\in S_n^+$ and suppose that we observe

$$\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{q}^{1/2}\mathbf{X}+\mathbf{Z}$$

We define the Gibbs measure $\langle\cdot\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}$ as the expectation associated to the posterior distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y})$. Let $\mathbf{x}$ be distributed according to $\langle\cdot\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}$ independently of everything else. We define the overlap function:

$$F_{P_X}:\mathbf{q}\in S_n^+\mapsto\mathbb{E}\langle\mathbf{x}\mathbf{X}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}=\mathbb{E}\left[\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}^\intercal\right]\in S_n^+$$

We also define the free energy function

$$\psi_{P_X}:\mathbf{q}\in S_n^+\mapsto\mathbb{E}\log\Big(\int_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n}dP_X(\mathbf{x})\exp\left(\mathbf{Z}^\intercal\mathbf{q}^{1/2}\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{X}^\intercal\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x}-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\intercal\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x}\right)\Big)$$

We easily verify that both functions are continuous over S_n^+. The next lemma states the main properties of these functions.

Lemma 39

(i) ψ_{P_X} *is convex,*

(ii) If $\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbf{X})$ *is inversible, then* ψ_{P_X} *is strictly convex.*

(iii) ψ_{P_X} *is differentiable on* S_n^+ *and for* $\mathbf{q} \in S_n^+$

$$\nabla \psi_{P_X}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2} F_{P_X}(\mathbf{q})$$

(iv) F_{P_X} *is non-decreasing in the sense that, if* $\mathbf{q}_1 \preceq \mathbf{q}_2$*, then* $F_{P_X}(\mathbf{q}_1) \preceq F_{P_X}(\mathbf{q}_2)$*.*

(v) For $\mathbf{q} \in S_k^+$*,* $\mathbf{0} \preceq F_{P_X}(\mathbf{q}) \preceq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\intercal]$ *(*$\prec \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\intercal]$ *if* $\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbf{X})$ *is inversible).*

(vi) $F_{P_X}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}]\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}]^\intercal$*.*

(vii) $F_{P_X}(\mathbf{q}) \xrightarrow[\mathbf{q}\to\infty]{} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\intercal\right]$*. (*$\mathbf{q} \to \infty$ *mean here that* ***all*** *the eigenvalues of* $\mathbf{q}$ *go to infinity).*

Proof. To prove (i) it suffices to show that $g : t \in [0,1] \mapsto \psi_{P_X}(t\mathbf{q}_1 + (1-t)\mathbf{q}_2)$ is convex, for all $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2 \in S_n^+$.

Let $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2 \in S_n^+$. Let $\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n)$ two independent standard random variables, independent of any other random variable. Define $\mathbf{q}_t = t\mathbf{q}_1 + (1-t)\mathbf{q}_2$. We have

$$\mathbf{q}_t^{1/2}\mathbf{Z} = \sqrt{t}\mathbf{q}_1^{1/2}\mathbf{Z}_1 + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{q}_2^{1/2}\mathbf{Z}_2$$

in law. Define for $t \in [0,1]$,

$$g(t) = \psi_{P_X}(\mathbf{q}_t) = \mathbb{E}\log\Big(\int dP_X(\mathbf{x}) \exp\left(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{Z}_1^\intercal \mathbf{q}_1^{1/2}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{Z}_2^\intercal \mathbf{q}_1^{1/2}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{q}_t \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{q}_t \mathbf{x}\right)\Big)$$

g is continuous on $[0,1]$, differentiable on $(0,1)$. Let $t \in (0,1)$. Define $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}_1 - \mathbf{q}_2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
g'(t) &= \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \frac{1}{2\sqrt{t}}\mathbf{Z}_1^\intercal \mathbf{q}_1^{1/2}\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-t}}\mathbf{Z}_2^\intercal \mathbf{q}_2^{1/2}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{q}\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{q}\mathbf{x}\Big\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{q}_2 \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{q}\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{q}\mathbf{x}\Big\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t} - \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{q}_1\Big\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t}\langle \mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t} + \mathbb{E}\Big\langle \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\intercal \mathbf{q}_2\Big\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t}\langle \mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\Big\langle \mathbf{X}^\intercal \mathbf{q}\mathbf{x}\Big\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t} = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big(\mathbf{q}\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{x}\mathbf{X}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t}\big)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used successively Gaussian integration by parts and the Nishimori identity. This derivative is continuous in 0 and 1, so g is also differentiable at those points. This proves (iii).

Similar computations shows that for $t \in (0,1)$,

$$g''(t) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\big(\mathbf{q}(\langle \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t} - \langle \mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t}\langle \mathbf{x}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t})\big)^2\Big] \geq 0$$

by Lemma 41 below. This proves (i). To prove (ii) is suffices to show that $g''(t) > 0$ when $\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbf{X}) \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{q}_1 \neq \mathbf{q}_2$. Suppose that $g''(t) = 0$. Then $\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\big(\mathbf{q}(\langle \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t} - \langle \mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t}\langle \mathbf{x}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t})\big)^2\Big] = 0$ almost surely.

Lemma 40

If $\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbf{X}) \succ \mathbf{0}$ *then for all* $\mathbf{q} \in S_n^+$

$$\langle \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}} - \langle \mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}\langle \mathbf{x}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}} \succ \mathbf{0}$$

almost surely.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}} - \langle \mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}\langle \mathbf{x}^\intercal\rangle_{\mathbf{q}} \succeq \mathbf{0}$. Suppose that there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ such that $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$. Then $\big\langle \|\mathbf{v}^\intercal(\mathbf{x} - \langle \mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}})\|^2\big\rangle_{\mathbf{q}} = 0$. Therefore $\mathbf{v}^\intercal\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v}^\intercal\langle \mathbf{x}\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}$, $\langle\cdot\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}$-almost surely. However P_X is almost-surely absolutely continuous with respect to $\langle\cdot\rangle_{\mathbf{q}}$ (his Radon-Nikodym is almost surely > 0). This implies that $\mathbf{v}^\intercal\mathbf{X}$ is constant: $\mathbf{v}^\intercal\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{v} = 0$. We obtain a contradiction. □

Combining Lemmas 40 and 41 we obtain $\mathbf{q} = 0$ which is absurd. This proves (ii).

Notice that for $\mathbf{q} \in S_k^+$

$$\mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{X} - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\mathbf{q}})(\mathbf{X} - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\mathbf{q}})^\intercal\right] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\intercal] - F_{P_X}(\mathbf{q})$$

This proves the first part of (v). The second part follows from (iv) that we prove now. Let now $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in S_k^+$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$ let $\mathbf{q}_t = \mathbf{q} + t\mathbf{q}'$ and $h(t) = \mathbf{v}^\intercal F_{P_X}(\mathbf{q}_t)\mathbf{v}$. Using Gaussian integration by parts and the Nishimori property, one can show that

$$h'(t) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left\|\left(\langle \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\intercal \rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t} - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t}\langle \mathbf{x}^\intercal \rangle_{\mathbf{q}_t}\right)\mathbf{q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{v}\right\|^2 \geq 0$$

Now, if $\mathbf{q}' \succ \mathbf{0}$, using Lemma 40 we see that $h'(t) > 0$. This proves (iv).

(vi) is obvious, it remains to prove (vii). Let $\mathbf{q} \succ \mathbf{0}$. Then, considering the estimator $\mathbf{q}^{-1/2}\mathbf{Y}$ of $\mathbf{X}$ we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{X} - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\mathbf{q}})(\mathbf{X} - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\mathbf{q}})^\intercal\right] \preceq \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{q}^{-1/2}\mathbf{Y})(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{q}^{-1/2}\mathbf{Y})^\intercal\right] = \mathbf{q}^{-1}$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\intercal] - \mathbf{q}^{-1} \preceq F_{P_X}(\mathbf{q}) \preceq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\intercal]$ and (vii) follows. □

Lemma 41

Let $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ be two symmetric matrices. Suppose that $\mathbf{B}$ is semidefinite positive. Then

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B})^2\right] \geq 0$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{B} \succ \mathbf{0}$ we have equality if and only if $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. $\mathbf{B}$ is semidefinite positive, so it admits a square root $\mathbf{B}^{1/2}$. Define $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{B}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{1/2}$. Then

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B})^2\right] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\right] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{1/2}\mathbf{B}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{1/2}\mathbf{B}^{1/2}\right] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{B}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{1/2}\mathbf{B}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{1/2}\right] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{C}\mathbf{C}^\intercal\right] \geq 0$$

□

7.2 The min-max formula

Proposition 42

Suppose that $\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbf{V}) \succ \mathbf{0}$. Then

$$\sup_{(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) = \sup_{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+} \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \tag{67}$$

Moreover, these extrema are achieved over the same couples $(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$.

Proof. $\Gamma(\lambda)$ is a compact set. Let $(\mathbf{q}_1^*, \mathbf{q}_2^*) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$ that achieves the supremum of the left-hand side of (67). The function $\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+ \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1^*, \mathbf{q}_2)$ is convex (by Lemma 39) and his gradient at $\mathbf{q}_2^*$ is equal to

$$\frac{\lambda}{2}(F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2^*) - \mathbf{q}_1^*) = 0$$

because $(\mathbf{q}_1^*, \mathbf{q}_2^*) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$. Thus $\mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1^*, \mathbf{q}_2^*) = \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1^*, \mathbf{q}_2) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+} \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$.

We will denote $\Sigma_V = \mathbb{E}_{P_V}[\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\intercal]$. To prove the converse inequality, we will first show that on can restrict the supremum in $\mathbf{q}_1$ on the compact set

$$K_V = \left\{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+ \mid \mathbf{q}_1 \preceq \Sigma_V\right\}$$

Indeed, if $\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+ \setminus K_V$, then there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathbf{v}^\intercal \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{v} > \mathbf{v}^\intercal \Sigma_V \mathbf{v}$. We define, for $t > 0$

$$\phi(t) = \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, t\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\intercal)$$

ϕ is differentiable over $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ and for $t > 0$

$$\phi'(t) = \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[F_{P_V}(\lambda t \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\intercal)\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\intercal - \mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\intercal] = \frac{\lambda}{2}\left(\mathbf{v}^\intercal F_{P_V}(t\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\intercal)\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^\intercal \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{v}\right) \leq \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{v}^\intercal(\Sigma_V - \mathbf{q}_1)\mathbf{v}$$

Therefore, $\phi(t) \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{} -\infty$ and $\inf_{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) = -\infty$. We can thus restrict the supremum to K_V.

For $\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+$ we define $\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1} : \mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+ \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$ and $f(\mathbf{q}_1) = \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2} \phi_{\mathbf{q}_1}(\mathbf{q}_2)$. Let $\overset{\circ}{K}_V$ denote the interior of K_V in S_k^+, that is

$$\overset{\circ}{K}_V = \left\{ \mathbf{M} \in S_k^+ \;\middle|\; \mathbf{M} \prec \Sigma_V \right\}$$

Lemma 43

- *If $\mathbf{q}_1 \in \overset{\circ}{K}_V$, then $\inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$ is achieved at a unique $\mathbf{q}_2^* \in S_k^+$. Moreover,*

$$F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2^*) \succeq \mathbf{q}_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{q}_2^*(F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2^*) - \mathbf{q}_1)\right] = 0. \tag{68}$$

- *The function $f : \mathbf{q}_1 \in \overset{\circ}{K}_V \mapsto \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$ is differentiable, with gradient given by*

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{q}_1) = \frac{\lambda}{2}(F_{P_U}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_1) - \mathbf{q}_2^*) \tag{69}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{q}_1 \in \overset{\circ}{K}_V$ and define $\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1} : \mathbf{q}_2 \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$. $\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbf{V}) \succ \mathbf{0}$ thus by Lemma 39, $\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1}$ is strictly convex with gradient

$$\nabla \phi_{\mathbf{q}_1}(\mathbf{q}_2) = \frac{\lambda}{2}(F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2) - \mathbf{q}_1) \xrightarrow[\mathbf{q}_2 \to \infty]{} \frac{\lambda}{2}(\Sigma_V - \mathbf{q}_1) \succ 0$$

Consequently, $\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1}(\mathbf{q}_2) \xrightarrow[\mathbf{q}_2 \to \infty]{} +\infty$. $\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1}$ admits therefore a unique minimizer $\mathbf{q}_2^*$. (68) follows from the optimality conditions at $\mathbf{q}_2^*$.

Let $\mathbf{Q}_1 \in \overset{\circ}{K}_V$. We are going to show that f is differentiable on $\{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+ \mid \mathbf{q}_1 \prec \mathbf{Q}_1\}$. $\mathbf{Q}_1 \prec \Sigma_V$ so by Lemma 39 we can find $\mathbf{Q}_2 \in S_k^+$ such that for all $\mathbf{q}_2 \succeq \mathbf{Q}_2$, $F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2) \succ \mathbf{Q}_1$. Let now $\mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{q}_1 \prec \mathbf{Q}_1$. For all $\mathbf{q}_2 \succeq \mathbf{Q}_2$

$$\nabla \phi_{\mathbf{q}_1}(\mathbf{q}_2) = \frac{\lambda}{2}(F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2) - \mathbf{q}_1) \succ \mathbf{0}$$

Consequently, $\mathbf{q}_2^* \preceq \mathbf{Q}_2$. For $\mathbf{q}_1 \in \{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+ \mid \mathbf{q}_1 \prec \mathbf{Q}_1\}$, we have shown that the infimum is achieved at a unique point of a compact set. Thus, by an "envelope theorem" (Corollary 4 from [30]), f is differentiable on $\{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+ \mid \mathbf{q}_1 \prec \mathbf{Q}_1\}$ with gradient given by (69). The lemma follows. □

Let now

$$D_V = \left\{ \mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+ \;\middle|\; \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \text{ is finite} \right\}$$

From what we have seen until now, $\overset{\circ}{K}_V \subset D_V \subset K_V$. Notice that $f : \mathbf{q}_1 \mapsto \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$ is continuous over D_V. Indeed for $\mathbf{q}_1 \in D_V$

$$\inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) = \psi_{P_U}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1) + \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \left\{ \psi_{P_V}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_2) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{q}_2] \right\}$$

and the second term of the right-hand side is a concave function of $\mathbf{q}_1$ (as an infimum of linear functions) and is thus continuous. Moreover, one verify easily that if $f(\mathbf{q}_1) = -\infty$ for some $\mathbf{q}_1 \in K_V$, then $f(\mathbf{q}_1') \xrightarrow[\mathbf{q}_1' \in D_V \to \mathbf{q}_1]{} -\infty$. Consequently the supremum of f is achieved at some $\mathbf{q}_1^* \in D_V$.

Case 1: $\mathbf{q}_1^* \in \overset{\circ}{K}_V$.
The minimum of $\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1^*}$ is thus achieved at a unique $\mathbf{q}_2^* \in S_k^+$. The optimality condition of f at $\mathbf{q}_1^*$ gives:

$$\frac{\lambda}{2}(F_{P_U}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_1^*) - \mathbf{q}_2^*) = \nabla f(\mathbf{q}_1^*) \preceq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^* \nabla f(\mathbf{q}_1^*)] = 0$$

Compute now

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1^*}(F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*)) &= \psi_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*) + \psi_{P_V}(\lambda F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*)) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^* F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*)] \\ &\leq \psi_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*) + \psi_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^*) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^*\mathbf{q}_2^*] + \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^*(\mathbf{q}_2^* - F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*))] \quad (\text{because } \mathbf{q}_2^* \succeq F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*)) \\ &= \phi_{\mathbf{q}_1^*}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^*) \quad (\text{using (68)})\end{aligned}$$

$\mathbf{q}_2^*$ is the unique minimizer of $\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1^*}$, therefore $\mathbf{q}_2^* = F_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*)$. By (68) we have $F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^*) \succeq \mathbf{q}_1^*$. Suppose that $\mathbf{q}_1^* \neq F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^*)$. Then by strict convexity of ψ_{P_U} (Lemma 39) we have $\psi_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*) < \psi_{P_U}(\lambda F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^*))$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}f(F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^*)) &> \psi_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*) + \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \psi_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^*)\mathbf{q}_2] \\ &= \psi_{P_U}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_1^*) + \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \psi_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^*\mathbf{q}_2] \quad (\text{because of (68)}) \\ &= f(\mathbf{q}_1^*)\end{aligned}$$

which is absurd because $\mathbf{q}_1^*$ maximizes f. We conclude that $\mathbf{q}_1^* = F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^*)$ and $(\mathbf{q}_1^*, \mathbf{q}_2^*) \in \Gamma(\lambda)$ and therefore

$$\sup_{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+} \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) = \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1^*, \mathbf{q}_2^*) \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \in \Gamma(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$$

Case 2: $\mathbf{q}_1^* \in D_V \setminus \overset{\circ}{K}_V$.

Let $(\delta_n)_n$ be an increasing positive sequence that converges to 1. For $n \geq \mathbb{N}$ we define $\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)} = \delta_n \mathbf{q}_1^* \in \overset{\circ}{K}_V$. Let $\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)} \in S_k^+$ be the minimum of $\phi_{\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}}$. By continuity of f at $\mathbf{q}_1^*$:

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}, \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \sup_{\mathbf{q}_1 \in S_k^+} \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \mathcal{F}(\lambda, \mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$$

Let $(\mathbf{v}_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k^{(n)}) \in (\mathbb{R}^k)^k$ be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of $\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}$ and $(\mu_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mu_k^{(n)}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$ be the associated eigenvalues. Without loss of generalities, one can assume that $(\mathbf{v}_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k^{(n)})$ converges to a orthonormal basis $(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k)$, and $(\mu_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mu_k^{(n)})$ converges to $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ where $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_k$ are in $\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$. We also denote $\mathbf{R}^{(n)} = (\mathbf{v}_1^{(n)} | \dots | \mathbf{v}_k^{(n)}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{v}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{v}_k)$. Suppose that $\mu_1 < +\infty$. Then $\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \mathbf{R}\mathbf{Diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)\mathbf{R}^\intercal$ and $F_{P_V}(\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} F_{P_V}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{Diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)\mathbf{R}^\intercal)$. Equation (68) and Lemma 39 give then

$$\Sigma_V \succ F_{P_V}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{Diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)\mathbf{R}^\intercal) \succeq \mathbf{q}_1^*$$

which is absurd. Therefore, there exists $r \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_r = +\infty$ and $\mu_{r+1}, \dots, \mu_k < \infty$.

Lemma 44

For $1 \leq i \leq r$

$$\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal} F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)})\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \mathbf{v}_i^\intercal \Sigma_V \mathbf{v}_i > 0$$

Proof. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Notice that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\mathbf{V} - \langle \mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\mathbf{v}\rangle_{\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}}\right)^2\right] = \mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\Sigma_V\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)} - \mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}F_{P_V}(\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)})\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)}$$

The left-hand side is the minimum mean square error for the estimation of $\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\mathbf{V}$ with the observation $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)1/2}\mathbf{V} + \mathbf{Z}$. Consider the estimator $\theta^{(n)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_i^{(n)}}}\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\mathbf{V} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_i^{(n)}}}Z'$, where $Z' \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. This estimator has a sub-optimal mean square error:

$$0 \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\mathbf{V} - \langle \mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\mathbf{v}\rangle_{\lambda\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}}\right)^2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal}\mathbf{V} - \theta^{(n)}\right)^2\right] = \frac{1}{\mu_i^{(n)}} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

□

Using the Lemma above

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)} F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)})\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mu_i^{(n)} \left(\mathbf{v}_i^{(n)\intercal} F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}) \mathbf{v}_i^{(n)}\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} +\infty$$

By (68) we have thus

$$(1-\delta_n)\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^* \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}] = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)} \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)} F_{P_V}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)})\right]$$

We conclude that $\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^* \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} +\infty$. Recall that $g : \mathbf{q}_1 \mapsto \inf_{\mathbf{q}_2 \in S_k^+} \psi(\lambda \mathbf{q}_2) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{q}_2]$ is concave on its domain D_V. Since $\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)} \in \overset{\circ}{K}_V$, $\nabla g(\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}) = -\frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}$. By concavity we have then

$$g(\mathbf{q}_1^*) \leq g(\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[(\mathbf{q}_1^* - \mathbf{q}_1^{(n)})\mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}] = g(\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\delta_n \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^* \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}]$$

Consequently

$$f(\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}) = g(\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}) + \psi_{P_U}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}) \geq g(\mathbf{q}_1^*) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\delta_n \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^* \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}] + \psi_{P_U}(\lambda(\mathbf{q}_1^*(1-\delta_n)))$$

ψ_{P_U} has bounded gradient and is thus L-Lipschitz for some constant $L > 0$. We have then

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{q}_1^{(n)}) &\geq g(\mathbf{q}_1^*) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\delta_n \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^* \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}] + \psi_{P_U}(\lambda \mathbf{q}_1^*) - L\lambda \|\mathbf{q}_1^*\| \delta_n \\ &\geq f(\mathbf{q}_1^*) + \delta_n \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{q}_1^* \mathbf{q}_2^{(n)}] - L\|\mathbf{q}_1^*\|\right) \\ &> f(\mathbf{q}_1^*) \end{aligned}$$

for n large enough. This is absurd. We conclude that we can not have $\mathbf{q}_1^* \in D_V \setminus \overset{\circ}{K}_V$. □

References

[1] Michael Aizenman, Robert Sims, and Shannon L Starr. Extended variational principle for the sherrington-kirkpatrick spin-glass model. *Physical Review B*, 68(21):214403, 2003.

[2] Jinho Baik, Gérard Ben Arous, and Sandrine Péché. Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for nonnull complex sample covariance matrices. *Annals of Probability*, pages 1643–1697, 2005.

[3] Jess Banks, Cristopher Moore, Nicolas Verzelen, Roman Vershynin, and Jiaming Xu. Information-theoretic bounds and phase transitions in clustering, sparse pca, and submatrix localization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.05222v2*, 2016.

[4] Jean Barbier, Mohamad Dia, Nicolas Macris, and Florent Krzakala. The mutual information in random linear estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.02335*, 2016.

[5] Jean Barbier, Mohamad Dia, Nicolas Macris, Florent Krzakala, Thibault Lesieur, and Lenka Zdeborová. Mutual information for symmetric rank-one matrix estimation: A proof of the replica formula. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 424–432, 2016.

[6] Adriano Barra, Giuseppe Genovese, and Francesco Guerra. The replica symmetric approximation of the analogical neural network. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 140(4):784–796, 2010.

[7] Adriano Barra, Giuseppe Genovese, and Francesco Guerra. Equilibrium statistical mechanics of bipartite spin systems. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 44(24):245002, 2011.

[8] Florent Benaych-Georges and Raj Rao Nadakuditi. The singular values and vectors of low rank perturbations of large rectangular random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 111:120–135, 2012.

[9] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press, 2013.

[10] Amin Coja-Oghlan, Florent Krzakala, Will Perkins, and Lenka Zdeborova. Information-theoretic thresholds from the cavity method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.00814*, 2016.

[11] Yash Deshpande and Andrea Montanari. Information-theoretically optimal sparse pca. In *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 2197–2201. IEEE, 2014.

[12] David L Donoho, Arian Maleki, and Andrea Montanari. Message-passing algorithms for compressed sensing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(45):18914–18919, 2009.

[13] SF Edwards and Raymund C Jones. The eigenvalue spectrum of a large symmetric random matrix. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 9(10):1595, 1976.

[14] Delphine Féral and Sandrine Péché. The largest eigenvalue of rank one deformation of large wigner matrices. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 272(1):185–228, 2007.

[15] Francesco Guerra. Broken replica symmetry bounds in the mean field spin glass model. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 233(1):1–12, 2003.

[16] Dongning Guo, Shlomo Shamai, and Sergio Verdú. Mutual information and minimum mean-square error in gaussian channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(4):1261–1282, 2005.

[17] John J Hopfield. Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 79(8):2554–2558, 1982.

[18] Yukito Iba. The nishimori line and bayesian statistics. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 32(21):3875, 1999.

[19] Adel Javanmard and Andrea Montanari. State evolution for general approximate message passing algorithms, with applications to spatial coupling. *Information and Inference*, page iat004, 2013.

[20] Satish Babu Korada and Nicolas Macris. Exact solution of the gauge symmetric p-spin glass model on a complete graph. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 136(2):205–230, 2009.

[21] Satish Babu Korada and Nicolas Macris. Tight bounds on the capacity of binary input random cdma systems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(11):5590–5613, 2010.

[22] Florent Krzakala, Jiaming Xu, and Lenka Zdeborová. Mutual information in rank-one matrix estimation. In *Information Theory Workshop (ITW), 2016 IEEE*, pages 71–75. IEEE, 2016.

[23] Marc Lelarge and Léo Miolane. Fundamental limits of symmetric low-rank matrix estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.03888*, 2016.

[24] Thibault Lesieur, Caterina De Bacco, Jess Banks, Florent Krzakala, Cris Moore, and Lenka Zdeborová. Phase transitions and optimal algorithms in high-dimensional gaussian mixture clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02918*, 2016.

[25] Thibault Lesieur, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. MMSE of probabilistic low-rank matrix estimation: Universality with respect to the output channel. In *53rd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing, Allerton 2015, Allerton Park & Retreat Center, Monticello, IL, USA, September 29 - October 2, 2015*, pages 680–687. IEEE, 2015.

[26] Thibault Lesieur, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. Phase transitions in sparse PCA. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2015, Hong Kong, China, June 14-19, 2015*, pages 1635–1639. IEEE, 2015.

[27] Thibault Lesieur, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. Constrained low-rank matrix estimation: Phase transitions, approximate message passing and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.00858*, 2017.

[28] Ryosuke Matsushita and Toshiyuki Tanaka. Low-rank matrix reconstruction and clustering via approximate message passing. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 917–925, 2013.

[29] Marc Mézard, Giorgio Parisi, and Miguel Virasoro. *Spin glass theory and beyond: An Introduction to the Replica Method and Its Applications*, volume 9. World Scientific Publishing Co Inc, 1987.

[30] Paul Milgrom and Ilya Segal. Envelope theorems for arbitrary choice sets. *Econometrica*, 70(2):583–601, 2002.

[31] Andrea Montanari. Estimating random variables from random sparse observations. *European Transactions on Telecommunications*, 19(4):385–403, 2008.

[32] Hidetoshi Nishimori. *Statistical physics of spin glasses and information processing: an introduction*, volume 111. Clarendon Press, 2001.

[33] Dmitry Panchenko. *The Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[34] Amelia Perry, Alexander S Wein, and Afonso S Bandeira. Statistical limits of spiked tensor models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.07728*, 2016.

[35] Amelia Perry, Alexander S Wein, Afonso S Bandeira, and Ankur Moitra. Optimality and sub-optimality of pca for spiked random matrices and synchronization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.05573*, 2016.

[36] Sundeep Rangan and Alyson K Fletcher. Iterative estimation of constrained rank-one matrices in noise. In *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2012 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 1246–1250. IEEE, 2012.

[37] Michel Talagrand. *Mean field models for spin glasses: Volume I: Basic examples*, volume 54. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.

[38] David J Thouless, Philip W Anderson, and Robert G Palmer. Solution of'solvable model of a spin glass'. *Philosophical Magazine*, 35(3):593–601, 1977.

[39] Lenka Zdeborová and Florent Krzakala. Statistical physics of inference: Thresholds and algorithms. *Advances in Physics*, 65(5):453–552, 2016.